



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

The American Catholic quarterly review

208

A 5123

ANNEX



LELAND STANFORD JUNIOR UNIVERSITY

ANNEX

THE
AMERICAN
CATHOLIC QUARTERLY
REVIEW

Under the Direction of
MOST REV. PATRICK JOHN RYAN, D. D.
ASSOCIATE EDITORS, RT. REV. MGR. J. F. LOUGHLIN, D. D., AND VERY REV.
JAMES P. TURNER, V. G.

Bonum est homini ut eum veritas vincat volentem, quia malum est homini ut eum veritas
vincat invitum. Nam ipsa vincat necesse est, sive negantem sive confitentem.
S. AUG. EPIST. ccxxxviii. AD PASCENT.

VOLUME XXVIII.
FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER, 1903.

PHILADELPHIA :
211 SOUTH SIXTH STREET.

134312

Entered according to Act of Congress,
in the year 1902,
By P. J. RYAN,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at
Washington, D. C.

YBA3311
R0011.0607142 01A.11
V1293V110

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Ancient Commerce with East Africa and the "Orphir" of King Solomon—Rev. J. D. Murphy, S. J.	157
Attitude of Modern Protestants Toward the Virginity of Our Blessed Lady—Rev. A. J. Maas, S. J.	209
Burns, C. S. C., Very Rev. J. A. The Training of the Teacher. .	664
Carmelogia—Anon	60
Catholic Democracy—Wilfrid Ward.....	19
Catholic University, Some of the Advantages of the—Rev. John F. Mullany, LL. D.	479
Chapters in Irish History Connected with the Union—R. R. Elliot	780
Clinch, Bryan J. Ireland in the Twentieth Century.....	649
Concordat of 1801, Since in Force, The Treaty Between the Holy See and France Known as the—R. R. Elliot.....	543
Connellan, P. L. Leo XIII.....	627
Conservation of Energy and Voluntary Activity, The—Rev. Michael O'Kane, O. P.	588
Coupe, S. J., M. A., Rev. Charles. Tennysonian Sea-Echoes...	455
Crusades: How Mediæval Europe Expanded, The—Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, D. D.	1
Democracy, Catholic—Wilfrid Ward.....	19
Des Cartes and the Philosophy of the French Revolution—Rev. George McDermot, C. S. P.	272
Divorce, The Teaching of the New Testament and of the Church Regarding—Rev. Hugh Pope, O. P.	807
Dolorosa, The Two Stabats—The—Rev. H. T. Henry, Lit. D. .	291
Duelling: Its Early History—L. Willaert, S. J.	463
Education and Its Remedy, A Fatal Error in—Rev. Robert Schwickerath, S. J.	756
Elementary Instruction, The Social Bearing of—Rev. W. Po- land, S. J.	142
Elliot, R. R. Chapters in Irish History Connected with the Union	780

	PAGE
Elliot, R. R. The Jesuits of L'Ancien Regime Who Labored on Michigan Soil—Their Detractors.....	90
Elliot, R. R. The Treaty Between the Holy See and France Known as the Concordat of 1801, Since in Force.....	543
Encyclical—The Church in the Philippines.....	372
Encyclical—To the Bishops of Italy.....	380
Encyclical—"Vigilantiæ"	171
English Educational Bill: Getting Back to First Principles, The—John J. O'Shea.....	114
Example of Napoleon, The—Rev. D. A. Merrick, S. J.....	354
Fatal Error in Education and Its Remedy, A—Rev. Robert Schwickerath, S. J.....	756
FitzSimons, Rev. L. "Lest We Forget".....	490
France Known as the Concordat of 1801, Since in Force, The Treaty Between the Holy See and—R. R. Elliot.....	543
French Revolution, Des Cartes and the Philosophy of the—Rev. George McDermot, C. S. P.....	272
Hegel and the Schoolmen—Rev. W. H. Kent, O. S. C.....	704
Henry, Lit. D., Rev. H. T. The Two Stabats.....	68, 291
Hewit, C. S. P., Very Rev. Augustine F. Rev. Henry E. O'Keeffe, C. S. P.....	535
Historical and Religious Origins of Our Recent Immigrants from Eastern Europe—Rev. Reuben Parsons, D. D.....	37
History of Schools—A Suppressed Chapter—Rev. W. Poland, S. J.....	248
Home Rule and Mr. Chamberlain's Zollverein—Rev. George McDermot, C. S. P.....	722
Immigrants from Eastern Europe, The Historical and Religious Origins of Our Recent—Rev. Reuben Parsons, D. D.....	37
Instruction, The Social Bearing of Elementary—Rev. W. Po- land, S. J.....	142
Ireland, Land Purchase in—Rev. George McDermot, C. S. P. . .	565
Ireland in the Twentieth Century—Bryan J. Clinch.....	649
Irish Historian of the Seventeenth Century, An—Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, D. D.....	310
Irish History Connected with the Union, Chapters in—R. R. Elliot	780
Jesuits of L'Ancien Regime Who Labored on Michigan Soil— Their Detractors, The—R. R. Elliot.....	90

Table of Contents.

v

	PAGE
Kent, O. S. C., Rev. W. H. Hegel and the Schoolmen.....	704
Kerby, Ph. D., Rev. William J. Reform and Reformers.....	227
Kerby, Ph. D., Rev. William J. Social Reform.....	521
Land Purchase in Ireland—Rev. George McDermot, C. S. P....	565
Lea on the Causes of the Reformation, Dr. H. C.—Rev. Herbert Thurston, S. J.....	417
Leo XIII.—P. L. Connellan.....	627
“Lest We Forget”—Rev. L. FitzSimons.....	490
Literature of Dirt, Doubt and Despair, The—Rev. John Talbot Smith	130
Maas, S. J., Rev. A. J. Attitude of Modern Protestants Towards the Virginity of Our Blessed Lady.....	209
Mangan, James Clarence—R. F. O'Connor.....	435
Mary, The Passing of—J. H. W.....	513
Mary Magdalen? Who Was Saint—Rev. Hugh Pope, O. P....	259
McDermot, C. S. P., Rev. George. Des Cartes and the Phil- osophy of the French Revolution.....	272
McDermot, C. S. P., Rev. George. Home Rule and Mr. Cham- berlain’s Zollverein.....	722
McDermot, C. S. P., Rev. George. Land Purchase in Ireland..	565
McNab, O. P., Rev. Vincent. The Twelfth Promise.....	742
Merrick, S. J., Rev. D. A. The Example of Napoleon.....	354
Most Rev. Patrick John Ryan, D. D., LL. D.—Fifty Years a Priest	625
Mullany, LL. D., Rev. John F. Some of the Advantages of the Catholic University.....	479
Murphy, S. J., Rev. J. D. Ancient Commerce with East Africa and the “Orphir” of King Solomon.....	157
Napoleon, The Example of—Rev. D. A. Merrick, S. J.....	354
O'Connor, R. F. James Clarence Mangan.....	435
O’Kane, O. P., Rev. Michael. The Conservation of Energy and Voluntary Activity.....	588
O’Keeffe, C. S. P., Rev. Henry E. Very Rev. Augustine F. Hewit, C. S. P.....	535
O’Shea, John J. The English Educational Bill: Getting Back to First Principles.....	114
O’Sullivan, S. J., Rev. D. T. Scientific Chronicle..	182, 389, 603, 815
Papacy as a Naval Power, The—Donat Sampson.....	683

	PAGE
Papal Allocution on Christian Democracy.....	387
Parsons, D. D., Rev. Reuben. The Historical and Religious Origins of Our Recent Immigrants from Eastern Europe....	37
Passing of Mary, The—J. H. W.....	513
Philosophy of the French Revolution, Des Cartes and the—Rev. George McDermot, C. S. P.....	272
Poland, S. J., Rev. William. History of Schools—A Suppressed Chapter	248
Poland, S. J., Rev. William. The Social Bearing of Elementary Instruction	142
Pope, O. P., Rev. Hugh. The Teaching of the New Testament and of the Church Regarding Divorce.....	807
Pope, O. P., Rev. Hugh. Who Was Saint Mary Magdalen?...	259
Popular Play, The—Rev. John Talbot Smith.....	339
Reform, Social—Rev. William J. Kerby, Ph. D.....	521
Reform and Reformers—Rev. William J. Kerby, Ph. D.....	227
Reformation, Dr. H. C. Lea on the Causes of the—Rev. Herbert Thurston, S. J.....	417
Ryan, D. D., LL. D., Most Rev. P. J. Fifty Years a Priest....	625
Sampson, Donat. The Papacy as a Naval Power.....	683
Scientific Chronicle—Rev. D. T. O'Sullivan S. J..182, 389, 603, 815	
Schools—A Suppressed Chapter, History of—Rev. W. Poland, S. J.....	248
Schoolmen, Hegel and the—Rev. W. H. Kent, O. S. C.....	704
Schwickerath, S. J., Rev. Robert. A Fatal Error in Education and Its Remedy.....	756
Shahan, D. D., Rev. Thomas. An Irish Historian of the Seven- teenth Century.....	310
Shahan, D. D., Rev. Thomas J. The Crusades: How Mediæval Europe Expanded.....	1
Smith, Rev. John Talbot. The Literature of Dirt, Doubt and Despair	130
Smith, Rev. John Talbot. The Popular Play.....	339
Social Bearing of Elementary Instruction, The—Rev. W. Po- land, S. J.....	142
Social Reform—Rev. William J. Kerby, Ph. D.....	521
Some of the Advantages of the Catholic University—Rev. John F. Mullany, LL. D.....	479
Stabats, The Two—Rev. H. T. Henry, Lit. D.....	68, 291
Teacher, The Training of the—Very Rev. J. A. Burns, C. S. C..	664

	PAGE
Teaching of the New Testament and of the Church Regarding	
Divorce, The—Rev. Hugh Pope, O. P.....	807
Tennysonian Sea-Echoes—Rev. Charles Coupe, S. J., M. A....	455
Thurston, S. J., Rev. Herbert. Dr. H. C. Lea on the Causes of	
the Reformation.....	417
Training of the Teacher, The—Very Rev. J. A. Burns, C. S. C..	664
Treaty Between the Holy See and France Known as the Con-	
cordat of 1801, Since in Force, The—R. R. Elliot.....	543
Twelfth Promise, The—Rev. Vincent McNabb, O. P.....	742
Two Stabats, The—Rev. H. T. Henry, Lit. D.....	68, 291
University, Some of the Advantages of the Catholic—Rev. John	
F. Mullany, LL. D.....	479
W., J. H. The Passing of Mary.....	513
Ward, Wilfrid. Catholic Democracy.....	19
Willaert, S. J., L. Duelling: Its Early History.....	463
Who Was Saint Mary Magdalen?—Rev. Hugh Pope, O. P....	259

BOOKS REVIEWED.

	PAGE
Allen and Grenough's New Latin Grammar.....	829
Apology for the Religious Orders, An—Procter.....	410
A-t-on Intérêt à S'Emparer du Pouvoir?—Demolins.....	190
Benziger's Magazine.....	204
Breviarium Romanum.....	623
Carmina Mariana—Shipley.....	204
Casus Conscientiae—Lehmkuhl.....	832
Christian Apologetics—Devivier.....	823
Colonel A. K. McClure's Recollections.....	830
Compendium Theologiae Moralis—Gury.....	201
De Deo Uno et Trino—Piccirelli.....	196
De Perfectione vitae Spiritualis—Le Guardier.....	415
Dictionary of the Bible, A—Hastings.....	193
Die Geschichte des Leidens—Belser.....	829

	PAGE
Die Messe im Deutschen Mittelalter—Franz.....	404
Discourses Doctrinal and Moral—McEvilly.....	200
Etudes sur St. Jerome—Sanders.....	617
Faith of Old England, The—Hornyold.....	195
Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII., The—Wynne....	821
Handbuch der Allgemeinen Kirchengeschichte—Kirsch.....	408
Harmony of the Religious Life, The—Heuser.....	413
Histoire de Livres du N. Testament—Jacquier.....	198
Historic Highways of America.....	205, 622
History of the German People—Janssen.....	606
Instructio Pastoralis Eystettensis.....	831
Instructiones Juris Ecclesiastici—Laurentius.....	832
Ireland Under English Rule—Emmett.....	827
Jones Readers, The.....	829
Julien l'Apostat—Allard.....	398
Konversations-Lexicon—Herder	411
Latin Grammar—Hale and Buck.....	828
Les Saints.....	619
Life of St. Philip Neri, The—Antrobus.....	412
Making of Our Middle Schools, The—Brown.....	402
Manual of Christian Doctrine.....	414
Mariae Corona—Sheehan.....	207
Music in the History of the Western Church—Dickinson.....	188
Onward and Upward—Egan.....	203
Philippine Islands, The.....	406, 620, 825
Practical Explanation and Application of Bible History—Nash..	206
Praelectiones Philosophiae Scholasticae—Germano.....	621
Question-Box Answers, The—Conway.....	616
Relation de Terre Sainte—Chavanon.....	206
Round Table of German Catholic Novelists, A.....	414
Saint Dominic—Guiraud.....	207
Search-Light of St. Hippolytus, The—Flournoy.....	612
Sermons for All the Sundays—Deshon.....	199
Sermons from the Latins—Baxter.....	207
Synopsis Theologiae Moralis et Pastoralis—Tanqueray.....	202
Traces of the Elder Faiths of Ireland—Wood-Martin.....	409
Tractatus de Deo-Homine—Janssen.....	831
Twenty-five Plain Catholic Sermons—Holland.....	415
Un Pape Français—Paulot.....	400

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the *QUARTERLY* will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the *REVIEW* not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXVIII.—JANUARY, 1903—No. 109.

THE CRUSADES: HOW MEDIÆVAL EUROPE EXPANDED.

IF the venerable cathedrals of Europe are the highest expression of the domestic or internal life of mediæval Catholicism, the Crusades are its principal public and political enterprise. By the Crusades we understand great armed expeditions of Christian Europe, undertaken at the command or suggestion of the Pope, with the purpose of rescuing the Holy Land from the control of the Mussulmans. They were originally meant as pious and religious works. Whoever joined them wore upon his breast a cross of cloth, and took a vow to fight for the Sepulchre of Jesus Christ and never to return to Europe before he had prayed within its holy precincts. They cover a period of two hundred years—the twelfth and the thirteenth centuries, during which time all Europe resounded to the tread of martial men, and the sublime cry of "God wills it, God wills it" was heard from Sicily to Norway. In this period the whole cycle of human passions was aroused, every human interest found a voice, and every human activity a channel or outlet.

In these two hundred years took place the transition of the European man from youth to manhood. He enters upon the twelfth century a creature of the heart, of sentiment and emotion, ignorant of the great world beyond his little hamlet or castle. He emerges from the thirteenth century, both layman and ecclesiastic, with world-wide experience, a clearer view of the relations of society

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1902, by P. J. Ryan, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

to history and geography, and with new qualities of mind and heart. The Crusades were often very human enterprises, and more than once degenerated from their sacred character, to become instruments of injustice and political folly. They have their dark and regrettable phases, and perhaps their influence has been, on given occasions and in given circumstances, detrimental. This is no more than can be said of many great historical movements, laudable in their spirit and original intention, only to degenerate with time and the irresistible force of circumstances or environment. Taken as a whole, they are the most important collective enterprise in the history of European mankind. They were an official work of Catholicism, as represented by its Supreme Head, the Bishop of Rome. He first instigated them; he roused the timid, hesitating kings and nobles; his letters awakened the Catholic multitudes in every land; his spiritual favors attracted them about the banners of their kings and princes; his legates marched at the head of every expedition. When all others grew weary and faint-hearted, he maintained courage and resolution. When cupidity and self-interest supplanted the original motives of faith and devotion to the Holy Land, he constantly recalled the true significance of these warlike expeditions. Whether the Crusades were the beginning of his great power in the Middle Ages, or the first step to the shipwreck of it, he was always their central figure. The public life of these two centuries really revolved about two poles—Rome and Jerusalem.

The peoples of mediæval Europe, like all simple peoples with their life-experience before them, were genuine hero-worshippers. They were feudal and military in their organization, very ardent, sympathetic and mobile. Religion was intelligible, tangible, in their saints and martyrs, just as the state secured their loyalty in and through the persons of their leaders, their counts, dukes, princes and kings. Loyalty was primarily to fixed persons in whom ideals and institutions were incarnate: to be a "masterless man" was equivalent to outlawry. Devotion and self-sacrifice were for persons and places—they had not yet learned to divide the abstract idea from its concrete expression.

Now, from their conversion to Catholicism, these peoples had cherished an intense devotion to the Person of Jesus Christ. He is their King who makes war against Satan, and the Apostles are his thanes, his generals, his counts and barons. His benign figure looks down from every altar, is enthroned in every apse, is sculptured on the walls, and uplifted over the doorway of every church. The first document of romantic theology is the well-known prologue to the Salic Law of the Franks. Since then all royal documents begin in His Name, all wills and testaments confess Him in

their opening paragraph. He is the beloved ideal of every heart, the burden of every discourse, the key-note of every original singer, and the inspiration of every immortal hymn. The first monument of mediæval Teutonic literature is the noble gospel-paraphrase of the ninth century known as the "Heliand"—in it Jesus Christ is the heavenly war-lord, worthy of all "Treue," symbol and fountain of all "Ehre." We shall never understand the Crusades, unless we grasp firmly the fact that the Middle Ages were a period of most universal and sincere devotion to the Person of Jesus Christ.

In such a world it was only natural that the severe penances needed to rouse a sense of sin in these rude and course natures should often take the form of a pilgrimage to the Holy Land where Jesus was born, lived and died. As the Middle Ages wore away, these pilgrimages grew in size and frequency. With the new religious spirit that created so many splendid churches in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries coincided some other things. The Popes had taken the popular side in their long struggle with the German Emperors, and had won the immediate victory. The great abbots of Cluny had aroused a new life all over Europe by their piety and that of the hundreds of monasteries which acknowledged their rule of life. After a long period of political inferiority and internal anarchy, the States of the West, disorganized since the death of Charlemagne, began to realize their strength. Vaguely it was felt that some common enterprise was needed to gather up all these new forces and currents.

In the great soul of Gregory VII., the man who more thoroughly than any other resumed the traditions and temper of the best Catholicism that preceded him, while he gave the watchwords for the centuries to come, this common enterprise was already clearly outlined, as early as the last quarter of the eleventh century. He saw that it would be better to consume the ardor and energy of men like the young and violent Henry VI. of Germany in efforts against a public, common, and threatening enemy, than to go on indefinitely in domestic broils and dissensions, Christian fighting against Christian, while all around the Mediterranean the Moslem was gradually spreading his power, and already threatened from very near that city of Constantinople which had so long been the bulwark of all the Christian population of the West. Indeed, the action of Sylvester II., the famous Gerbert (999-1003), would lead us to suspect that since the days of Gregory II., the "nec dicendi Hagareni" of the *Liber Pontificalis* had found in the papacy their native enemy. Islam was above all a religion, a warlike one in its essence and all its history, whose prosperity could only be gained at the expense of Christendom.

The time of Gregory VII. seemed also a favorable moment for the reunion of the Western and Eastern Churches. Scarce two hundred years had passed since the death of Photius, the scholarly but infamous man who had caused the breach that still lies open, and withdrawn the Christian peoples of the East from their union with the Head of the Christian religion, the successor of St. Peter. Constantinople was now in sore need of help against the warlike Seljuk Turks, who had been encroaching very deeply on Asia Minor, and now held all the overland roads to Syria and Palestine. This great city, the London of the Middle Ages, had exhausted its means and its armies. On nearly every side the world of Islam was surrounding it like a moving bog, slowly but surely. Four centuries of superhuman efforts, of wonderful ingenuity, of diplomacy, had not availed to stave off the day of reckoning that began when Mohammed haughtily ordered the Roman Emperor of his own day to do him homage. As a matter of fact it took four more centuries to reduce the Royal City beneath the Crescent—but the tide was already turning that way, and at Constantinople people, patriarchs and emperors recognized too well the painful fact, though they could never fully reconcile themselves to it, nor adopt the proper measures of reconciliation with the West. Is not the secret of it all in those terrible pages of Liudprand of Cremona? In them there breathe yet the racial contempt of the Greek for the Frank, the hoarded hope of vengeance, the senseless pride of origin, the bitter resentment of the transfer of loyalty by the Roman See, the angry despair at the sight of a free and vigorous West.

II.

If Rome and Jerusalem were the poles around which revolves the history of the Crusades, the city of Constantinople is the key to their failure. In these two centuries many thousands of armed knights on horseback gave up their lives to the Crusades. Countless thousands of foot-soldiers and camp-followers, pilgrims and the like, perished in the attempt to free the Holy Places. There were two ways to reach Jerusalem, one by land down the Danube and through Thrace to Constantinople, thence over Asia Minor into Syria; the other by sea from Venice to Genoa, which cities alone had fleets of transport galleys in those days. For the first century the Crusaders went by land. Arrived at Constantinople, they abandoned themselves, too often, to excess, after the fatigues and privations of the long journey. The roads were poor and they were ignorant of the local topography. The populations they passed through were also ignorant, and often hostile. This was especially

the case as they left behind them the uncertain boundaries of the West and approached the territory of Constantinople, and the sphere of its influence. The semi-barbarian world of Hungary, Bulgaria and the Balkans was deeply troubled at their coming. Indeed, they were rightly troubled, for the military chiefs of the Crusaders too often had views differing from those of the pious clergy and people. Not always were their ambitions bounded by that

Sepulchre in stubborn Jewry
Of the world's ransom, blessed Mary's Son.

They were mostly men of Norman blood or descent, state-destroyers and state-makers by profession. Many dreamed of new and rich feudal principalities, of independent sovereignties, of a golden life in the dreamy Orient. The law or custom of primogeniture, the feudal customs in favor of the eldest son, threw regularly a multitude of young ambitious men upon the theatre of European affairs, brothers of Kings, nephews of Queens, a mob of landless, disinherited men, and women, too, for whom fortune lay in the future and far away. They were the Conquistadori of the Middle Ages; to their ambitious, unholy, and evil counsels and purposes, is owing largely the failure of the religious scope of the Crusades. Between them on the one side, and the churchmen on the other, there was endless friction that often led to the gravest disasters.

It was in the time of the Crusades as in all other periods of human history—the genuine praiseworthy aims of religion were often perverted by the human instruments which acted in her name. The noble and useful ideals set forth at Rome and preached by a Saint Bernard, the high political advantages of the same, were perverted in the execution. Jerusalem was lost because a Bohemond or a Tancred set more store by a little feudal estate on the coast of Syria than by the real object of his vow. The Moslem's hour of division and weakness was allowed to go by, because Venice was jealous of the commercial superiority of Constantinople and plundered pitilessly, first the Crusaders themselves, and then her ancient suzerain, the great Royal City that, after all, had enabled Venice to rise by restraining the naval ambition of the Moslems, and preventing the Mediterranean from becoming the great lake of Islam, its easy highway into all Europe.

The Crusaders themselves, too often, listened to very earthly and low passions, and dissipated their numbers and strength before they came within sight of the Holy City. They carried along with them old burdens of jealousy, hatred, revenge, from their French or German homes. Upon the soil of Syria they cherished their traditional European policies and combinations. Their counsels were usually divided—those highly personal men who never recognized any

superior law at home, except through fear, were unlikely to bear the yoke of subordination abroad. Could Homer have arisen, he would have seen before Jerusalem or St. Jean d'Acre as before Ilion, no fewer armies than there were kings and princes, as many independent divisions as there were banners of great knights, as many sulking chiefs as there were disappointed ambitions. Many of them had never seen a great city. At that time all the cities of Europe were not worth, in wealth or luxury, the single city of Constantinople. Its brilliant civilization had never known interruption from the day of its foundation. As in modern London, the fattening currents of commerce had been flowing into it from the East and the West for seven hundred years and more. Its hundreds of splendid churches were almost equaled by the splendid civic buildings. The masterpieces of antiquity, the rich literature of ancient Greece, the traditions of all the arts, the high aristocratic sense of superiority, seemed to justify the proud attitude of the citizens towards these uneducated and coarse multitudes from the West. A profound bitterness, an almost inexplicable hatred of the Bishop of Rome, has always characterized the Greek clergy of Constantinople. Their claim was always that the clergy of the New Rome was the equal in authority and the superior in learning and refinement of the clergy of Old Rome. Here, by the Golden Horn, the traditions of the ancient imperial government were never broken, never forgotten. Each Christian Emperor felt that he was the genuine successor of Julius Cæsar and Augustus. The Western nations—England, France, Germany, Italy—were to him revolted provinces, that some mysterious design of God tolerated. No Emperor of Constantinople ever willingly addressed the German successors of Charlemagne as Emperor, only as King. In theory, the Greek Emperor was himself the Master of the civilized universe. This, too, although century by century his civil power waned. North, South, East, and West, the limits of empire were pared away. But the Romaic Cæsar at Constantinople only gathered with more dignity the folds of his purple robes, and prepared to perish with more fortitude amid the rising tides of modern barbarism. There is nothing more pathetic in history than this survival of ancient ideals and habits of political life. The aristocracy of Constantinople was politically rotten to the core, yet it remained stoically contemptuous of its Latin conquerors, from the impregnable strongholds of its own mind and heart. The mediæval knight might have saved Constantinople, if the classic soul of Old Rome, proud and exclusive, had not been so deeply infused into the organism of her prouder daughter, the New Rome. It was in the time of the Crusades, as it is to-day with the Greek clergy of that city—better a hundred times the rule

of the Crescent than any subjection to the Pope, better the sour bread of slavery and oppression than any recognition of the descendants of the Goths and Vandals.

In the beginning there was almost no order or harmony among the chiefs of the Crusades, and when they reached the Imperial City, their own greedy passions and its great weakness conspired to make them common pillagers, thieves and oppressors. To get rid of them the wily Greeks induced them to cross the Bosphorus, led them against the hordes of Turks, then betrayed and abandoned them. These new protectors of the Greeks were worse than their old enemies. So the bones of entire armies soon whitened the plains of Asia Minor. By thousands the simple-hearted but ignorant knights of France, England and Germany paid with their lives for their turbulent career in Constantinople, for their impolitic insults to the Greek who did not acknowledge the Bishop of Rome as head of the Christian religion, for their innocent trust in the leadership of some Byzantine general.

In the second century of the Crusades they usually take the fleets of Venice or Genoa to cross the Mediterranean—but at an enormous expense. Once, indeed, Venice tempted them to overthrow the Christian Empire at Constantinople, which was now her commercial rival. In spite of the Pope this act of folly and injustice was accomplished, and the city of Constantinople saw its remaining provinces divided between Frenchmen and Venetians. This was in 1204, and was only the prelude to a series of disastrous expeditions, each one more fatal than the other, until at last in 1270, St. Louis, King of France, the leader of the eighth great Crusade, died of the pest at Tunis in Africa, whither his brother, Charles of Anjou, had drawn him, against the King's own judgment, in order to collect some bad debts that were owing to French and Italian traders.

As a matter of fact, the First Crusade, under the brave knight, Godfrey of Bouillon, did capture Jerusalem in 1098. For a century the Holy City was Christian. It was lost at the end of the twelfth century, and though for a short while again in Christian hands, from 1229 to 1245, it then definitely passed away from the control of Christian Europe into the hands of the oppressive and cruel Turk. Its possession had fired the heart of Christian Europe for three generations. But this fated city was too great a political prize for Islam to lose. Gradually the Moslems healed their divisions. The Turkish sultans, men of great military genius, broke down the hundred little emirs, and lifted the Leather Apron of their mining Turanian ancestors over one fortress after another from the confines of Persia to the waters of the Mediterranean. Here along the coast of Syria, the Crusaders had built up several little states, organized with all

the ingenuity of feudal lawyers, in such a way that the superior lord should have all the pomp and titles of authority and the most inferior vassal be left to his own sweet will and temper. The innermost of these states, Edessa, faced the Euphrates and long bore the brunt of the Moslem Orient. It was the first to fall. Before the end of the thirteenth century they had all disappeared, and only the picturesque ruins of their fortified hill-tops remain to show what were once the hopes of a great Christian state in the Orient.

III.

The popular enthusiasm for the Crusades was originally universal. Kings, even Emperors of the West, led their armies in person and underwent great hardships. A German Emperor, Frederick Barbarossa, was drowned on the way across Asia Minor. St. Louis of France, as we have seen, died of the plague at Tunis. Noble princesses and high born ladies, too, accompanied these expeditions. But few of the great military chiefs stayed in the East. Most of the knights who remained were French, and it is to that period that goes back the use of the French language in the East, as well as the political prestige that France long enjoyed throughout the Mediterranean world.

In time experience taught these Crusaders who stayed in the Orient that the heavily armed knight of Europe, with his great battle horse, his huge lance and heavy sword, was ill fitted to carry on a guerilla warfare for the Holy Land. Three military orders arose, with reformed methods of warfare, that contributed much to the safety of pilgrims, the protection of Jerusalem, and of the fortified castles of Syria and Palestine. They were the Knights Hospitaller of St. John, the Knights of the Temple, and the Teutonic Knights. Originally established for the service of the sick, they became an organized feudal army of volunteers. Their castles arose all over the Holy Land, their bravery and adventures were in the mouth of every pilgrim. In them the romance and the poetry of the Crusades reached its height. All Europe looked on them as the true, the permanent Crusaders, and staked its hopes of recovery of the Holy Land on their skill and endurance. Thousands of estates were bestowed on them in the thirteenth century—their farms and castles stretched continuously from the Mediterranean to the Baltic and from the Atlantic to the Black Sea. It is in the vicissitudes of their history that we ought to look for the true ideal of the Crusades, and the measure of its realization.

The richest of them, the Templars, became the chief banking-house of Europe. In the fierce struggle between the Kings of

France and the Pope of Rome, the Knights of the Temple went down most tragically—the justice of their condemnation is yet, and perhaps always will be, an open question. The Teutonic Knights, after the loss of the Holy Land, turned their faces homeward to Germany. The soil of Prussia, then the home of barbarian pagan peoples, and of Northeastern Germany, was turned over to them, as a missionary brotherhood of laymen, with the purpose of overthrowing paganism and of establishing Christianity, incidentally of creating new marches for the Empire. Soon they were known as the *Schwertbrüder*, the Brothers of the Sword—a term that sufficiently well indicates the manner, if not the spirit, in which they propagated the gospel. Their splendid mediæval fortress still stands along the Baltic, the great pile of Marienburg, whence Pomerania, Lithuania, Esthonia, and all the border lands of Prussia and Russia received the Christian faith.

The Hospitallers, or Knights of St. John, after their expulsion from the Holy Land, clung still to the control of the port of Smyrna, and their fidelity has even yet its reward, for Smyrna is now to France what Shanghai is to England. Eventually they were established on the Island of Rhodes, where they remained until nearly four centuries ago (1520), when they were driven out by the Turk, after one of the most memorable sieges of history. Their last foothold on the Mediterranean was on the Island of Malta. In the latter half of the eighteenth century, they lost even this remnant of their old power, and with them the last glamor of the Crusades disappeared. There is yet an Order of the Knights of Malta, and the Pope still appoints a Grand Commander—but it is a mere ceremony. The old religious military orders, with their three vows of celibacy, poverty and obedience, have disappeared. Cardinal Lavigerie tried to establish one for the suppression of the slave-trade in the heart of Africa, but with indifferent success. Such institutions only flourish on the soil of simple and childlike faith; agnosticism and commercialism are too cold a soil for them.

In the Crusades took place the first great expansion of Europe. From the year 500 to the year 1100—for six hundred years—the peoples who now make up the great states of France, Germany, England, and Spain, were growing from infancy to mature youth, in a civic sense. All the rawness, weakness, waywardness, all the folly and strong violent passion of youth are upon them. They are in the hands of a gentle but firm nurse, the Catholic Church; but every now and then, they break away from school and there is pandemonium. The sea breaks out in the heart of the Anglo-Saxon, and the marsh in the heart of the Frank, the dark deep forest calls out in the soul of the German, and the Northman is again upon his

piratical galley. The early Middle Ages are apparently a perfect welter of disorder and anarchy. But somehow in the eleventh century, there is a beginning of better things. A King of France arises out of the wreckage of the French successors of Charlemagne's children. An Emperor grows strong, not only in name but in fact, among the Germans. He is in theory the Roman Emperor in the West, and though outside of Germany, his real power is small, this very theory of a one invisible Empire of Rome, that had never been destroyed, but only held in abeyance, as a trust, by the Bishop of Rome, gave once more a sacred, venerable character to the supreme civil authority. Then, too, the Roman Law was there as a significant commentary on what might be made out of the imperial name. The Church had saved it, assimilated it, christianized it, and in time the Emperors would use it as a leverage for far-reaching ambitions.

The old Gallo-Roman civilization had never utterly died out in France—the ancient Gaul, and now the traditions of old Rome in government and administration were handed down to the German Emperor by the clergy of Old Rome herself. In the traditions of architecture, in the use of the Latin classics, in legal procedure, in the continuous use of Latin as the tongue of religion, diplomacy and scholarship, the Roman Church had kept alive no little of the sober and practical Latin spirit—enough at least to act as a leaven for the new society that was to issue from the laboring womb of Europe. Thus, the modern world of Europe and America has become the daughter of the civilization of Rome and Greece, and not the theatre of Moslem propaganda.

It is true that the actual territory conquered from the Turks and held by the Christians of Europe, was never very great—the City of Jerusalem, some strongholds in Palestine, some ports in Syria. On the compact masses of Islam in Persia, Egypt and Northern Africa, they made little or no impression. In the Mediterranean the islands of Cyprus and Crete passed gradually into the possession of Venice. A corner of ancient Armenia remained some centuries semi-independent of Greek and Turk, under feudal influences of France. French families held on to feudal office and rights in Greece and the Archipelago. These were about all the positive gains and they have long since melted away. But the political results of the Crusades were very important in a negative and prohibitive way. Internally, the European States of Germany, France, England and Spain were very weak at the beginning of the Crusades. Feudalism had reached the point of utter disintegration. The royal authority, the concept of the State, all centralizing influences, were everywhere at their lowest ebb. Social anarchy was lifting threateningly its specter-like head. Shattering conflicts be-

tween the Church and immoral, arbitrary rulers were multiplying. Schisms in the Church, revolts and rebellions in the civil order, were growing. The warlike Turks, to whom had fallen the real power and wealth of the Caliphs at Bagdad and Cairo, were on the eve of capturing Constantinople. In great flotillas the equally warlike barbarians of the new states in Russia were coming down yearly by the Don and the Dnieper, and crossing the Black Sea with the same intention. The Arab kingdoms in Spain were at the height of their development. Had the Moslem Orient been left unmolested, free to carry on the Holy War according to the law of Mohammed, it would have found everywhere in Europe the Christians divided, ignorant of the great principles of the art of war, children in navigation, unable to carry on or resist sieges, half-barbarian and helpless in their diplomacy, the veriest lot of political infants one could imagine. From the summits of the Pyrenees, from the coasts of Sicily and Syria and Asia Minor, from the endless steppes of Russia, from the deepest Orient, would have come down again on the rich and tempting lands of Southern Europe hordes far worse than five or six centuries before had destroyed the Roman State. There is an organic law of preservation for states and civilizations that works like an instinct, and for Europe, since the days of Alaric and Attila, that instinct was incarnate in the Bishops of Rome. In spite of its unspeakable misfortunes, the Eternal City still held on to some of the large political traditions of antiquity. The very soil and the monuments kept them alive, as did the old laws of Rome and her spiritual authority that was recognized from the Mediterranean to the Baltic.

IV.

It was well for the world that at this time the West hurled itself upon the East and thereby arrested the political consolidation and growth of the latter. It did so at a propitious moment, when Islam was passing from the control of Arabs to that of Turks, and everywhere existed a feudal disorder not unlike that of the West. It accomplished the impossible in finding a splendid and inspiring symbol, the cross of Christ, for a dozen discordant nationalities. It seized on a psychological moment to weld into a common, conscious organic unity of Catholicism, all the nations of Europe that had hitherto been in communion, indeed, with Rome, but had not yet come into daily and vivifying contact with one another. In these long wars, the Moslem was made to fight for his existence; he was pushed finally out of the magnificent island of Sicily; he was driven from his perches in the Maritime Alps; he was hunted from his scattered, but ancient, strongholds in Southern Italy and Southern

France, whence he had for centuries been contemplating their conquest. A thousand Christian galleys on the Mediterranean and the Adriatic drove the corsairs of Africa to their distant lairs, and relieved the Christian people of the seaboard from the daily fear of slavery, their women from outrage, their children from ransom. This nameless horror of Moslem piracy, that has not yet finally disappeared, had paralyzed the Italian and French merchant, had suspended the natural free movement of peoples across the Mediterranean, was debasing the political sense of all the Christians of Southern Europe. In Visigothic Spain, the descendants of the Cid Campeador took heart once more. The good knight Roland had again arisen and from his last rock of defense had blown a strong blast that reëchoed over Europe. The Christian States of the Balkans (for if there is a Balkan question, it is owing to the failure of the Crusades), though ignorant and blind as to their welfare, got a long respite through the Crusades. Indeed, they put off entirely, if not political humiliation, at least any such complete assimilation into Islam as has fallen upon the Coptic race in Egypt. It is owing to the Crusades that the profound eternal antithesis and antipathy of the political ideals of East and West were brought out, precisely when the final adjustment of territorial limits was taking place. The great wars of Spain in the fifteenth century, that ended in the fall of Grenada, the great wars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries between Hungary and Austria on the one side, and the Sultans at Constantinople on the other, are really Crusades. Thus, at the very threshold of modern times these wars were the last death struggle between Islam and Christianity over two great natural bulwarks of Europe the Pyrenees and the Danube. There is the most intimate relationship of cause and effect between the siege of Jerusalem and its capture, that ended the first Crusade, and the siege of Vienna, that six hundred years later immortalized John Sobieski and broke triumphantly the last effort of Islam to extend its propaganda over Europe. What will you have, O Christians! the immoral reign of fatalism with the hopeless human degradation of the Orient, or the uplifting reign of freedom with the general human progress and exaltation of the Occident? Our fathers before us, walking in a dimmer light, chose decisively and made the history that I have been outlining. If the citizens of the Pacific coast gaze out to-day, as the masters of the future over an illimitable Orient; if the evil genius that some grave historians consider the real Antichrist, enthroned by the Golden Horn, is now threatened from the depths of the Orient itself; if the latest phase of this eternal warfare between the ideals of the oldest strata of humanity and those of the youngest, opens with universal victory written on our banners, we may know

that the temper, the spirit, the weapons, the persistency that have uplifted us, were not created in a day, any more than the conditions of the Orient are the result of yesterday.

Never did the great French Catholic statesman, Montalembert, utter a truer word than when, fifty years ago, he cried out in the French Chamber of Deputies: "We are the sons of the Crusaders." Freeman has said that all history is only the politics of the past, the sure and real interests of mankind which have gotten crystallized by the shaping activity of the present that strikes, stamps, and returns no more. History is not always mere writing or telling—very often it is the real conditions, the institutions, the social framework and circumstance of our lives, the actual dwelling that our ancestors have made for us. The Crusades were the great political school of the people of Europe, as they passed from their crude ebullient youth to the maturity of man's estate.¹ It is not without design that Shakespeare, dealing in Richard the Second with the most profound problems of the English Constitution, sets down among the public merits of a great English noble his devotion to the political ideals of Christendom:

Many a time hath banish'd Norfolk fought
For Jesu Christ in glorious Christian field
Streaming the ensign of the Christian Cross
Against black pagans, Turks, and Saracens.

The Crusades developed in a humane sense the art of war. Captives were habitually ransomed for money that was gravely needed by both sides, as the real sinews of war; thus the wholesale slaughter of more barbarous times was avoided. The men of the West learned the light Parthian tactics of the Orient, also the daily exercises with bow and lance and sword, the details of commissariat and transportation, the cost and difficulties and consequences of a great war.

¹ The Crusades are not, in my mind, either the popular delusions that our cheap literature has determined them to be, nor papal conspiracies against kings and peoples, as they appear to the Protestant controversialists; nor the savage outbreak of expiring barbarism, thirsting for blood and plunder, nor volcanic explosions of religious intolerance. I believe them to have been in their deep sources, and in the minds of their best champions, and in the main tendency of their results, capable of ample justification. They were the first great effort of mediæval life to go beyond the pursuit of selfish and isolated ambitions; they were the trial-feat of the young world, essaying to use, to the glory of God and the benefit of man, the arms of its new knighthood. That they failed in their direct object is only what may be alleged against almost every great design which the great disposer of events has moulded to help the world's progress; for the world has grown wise from the experience of failure, rather than by the winning of high aims. That the good they did was largely leavened with evil may be said of every war that had ever been waged; that bad men rose by them while good men fell, is, and must be true, wherever and whenever the race is to the swift and the battle to the strong. But that in the end they were a benefit to the world no one who reads can doubt; and that in their course they brought out a love for all that is heroic in human nature, the love of freedom, the honor of prowess, sympathy with sorrow, perseverance to the last, the chronicles of the age abundantly prove; proving, moreover, that it was by the experience of these times that the forms of those virtues were realized and presented to posterity.—Bishop Stubbs, "Seventeen Lectures on Mediæval and Modern History," p. 180.

Their weapons grew lighter, and their armor and horses more manageable. The ecclesiastic military orders, and the many European ladies of rank who followed their lords to the Sepulchre of Christ, introduced milder manners, and a humanity unknown to their earlier times. The sorrows and defeats of the Crusades, their humiliations and losses, were very often borne in a spirit of Christian faith, as a rebuke from God for their own wrong-doings and evil lives. The natural virtues of Islam, the courtesy and chivalry of its warriors, were not without their effect on the Christian knight. The legends of the Crusades are filled with figures of Moslems renowned for bravery and hospitality, gentleness and courtesy. A Richard Lion-Heart finds a Saladin his peer in many things.

The art of navigation profited very much by the Crusades—the vessels were made larger for the growing multitudes of pilgrims and warriors, for the transportation of horses and provisions. The masts and the sails were enlarged and were multiplied. The art of sailing by the wind was learned. Every such progress was a step towards the discovery of the new world. The skill of a Christopher Columbus was an inherited thing, acquired through the experience of several long generations of his ancestors in the service of Genoa.

We owe to the Crusades the use of the drum, the trumpet, the light and slender lance. The science of heraldry dates from that period, the Crusades, and though it may not contribute much to the comfort of humanity, it plays a prominent rôle in the development of the fine arts and of the social life of Europe in the last few centuries. Many fruit trees now common in the West were then introduced into Europe from Asia Minor, or the lowlands of Mesopotamia, their natural home. The apricot, the pear, the peach, the plum, trees and shrubs and flowers of uncommon beauty and elegance, made their way in this manner into the States of Europe. Some curious things found a new home for themselves; thus, the windmills that are so common yet in Holland and Brandenburg were imported from the Orient. Until the Crusades, no respectable man in Europe wore a beard—since then the observance of this civilized remnant of ancient society has been abandoned to the clergy. Healing recipes and plants of the Orient became the common property of the West. Medical theory and practice gained much by the study of Arabic writings that bore along the learning and experience of Greece. The hospital service at Jerusalem and elsewhere opened a new era in the history of Christian charity.

The cause of human freedom was greatly benefited by the Crusades. Knight and peasant fought side by side for many years, rendered mutual service, shared the same hardships, and learned to esteem one another. Thus, the theory of Christian equality was

daily reduced to reality. Then again, the knight needed ready money for his equipment, to pay off his creditors before departing, to provide for his family. He got it from his vassals, but before they paid it over, he was bound to secure them certain rights and privileges in solemn forms of writing. So arose on every estate of France and Germany free towns and cities, legally recognized by their former lords as independent and self-governing. Local and private feuds ceased to a great extent during the Crusades; there was a certain halo about the homes of those who were supposed to be bent on freeing the common home of all Christians. The national unities of France, England and Germany had then a chance to grow, unmolested by the earlier anarchy of primitive feudalism. The numerous serfs on the knights' estates became free peasants in time by service in the wars, or by purchase; at the other end of the state, the King entered at last upon the authority necessary to keep order and develop the common weal.

The mystery of the Orient, the long absences of the knights and their squires, the new strange romance of their lives, without parallel in the experience of the West, the curiosities of art and commerce that soon multiplied, gave a great impetus to the literatures of Europe—notably to poetry and song. The courtly troubadours and the gay Minnesinger are the creatures of the Crusades. The tournaments, the Courts of Love, the moderation and refining of personal manners, popular habits and institutions, all date from these great wars that furnished an infinity of data to the busy brain and the wagging tongue of many a strolling poet or musician from Otranto to Drontheim.

V.

Italy took little part, as a militant element, in the Crusades, partly because of its thorough disunion—partly because of its superior culture. The Italians soon saw that there was greater profit for them in the transportation of their Christian brethren, the care of the commissariat, and the establishment of commerce. After all, these were necessary things, and the great cities of Venice and Genoa were admirably located for the work as was also their rival Pisa. They enabled the Crusaders to cross the ocean quickly and successfully; they brought with them men skilled in the art of sieges; they were the secretaries and couriers of the French and German knights—supple, cautious, wiry, alert, very Christian indeed, but with a sharp eye for the goods of this world. They took out their pay in commercial privileges and are the genuine forerunners of all modern commerce. Along the coast of Syria and of Asia Minor,

from Smyrna to Beyrouth, there was in every port an Italian quarter. In the roadstead lay their galleys, high, broad, elegant for that day. In their special reservation were always a church, a bath, a bakery, wharves, stores, a market place, a bank and office of exchange. The Italian tongue was the tongue of Oriental commerce. Bookkeeping and the use of Arabic numerals, the system of drafts and bills of exchange, letters of credit and the like, sprang up on these foreign shores—the departing Templar or Hospitaller sold out his estate in Syria and received his money, his gold Bezants or Angels, over the counters of correspondents in Paris, London or Rome. The flag of Venice or Genoa or Pisa floated always over these little strongholds of commerce, that were long an abomination to the “malignant and turbaned Turk.” From the remoter Orient came through the hands of the Italian merchant the silks of China, the spices of Borneo, the fruits of Asia Minor, the ivory and pearls of India. His correspondents were at Naples and Milan and Florence, at Marseilles and Bordeaux, at London and Paris, at Kieff and Novgorod. Oranges and figs, sugar and wine and oil, brocades and muslins, fine tapestries and costly rugs, colored glass of Tyre and steel blades of Damascus—a thousand articles of use and ornament, could be met with upon his manifests. And so the city life of Europe took on a charm, an elegance, a variety that it had never known before. The middle classes date from those days—the opulent tradesman and the cultured merchant, the skilled laborer and the substantial banker. The turbulent republics of Italy, the first great temple of democracy since the overthrow of Athens and Sparta, arose on this trade, and by their wealth defied emperor and baron, by their wealth permitted themselves the expensive luxury of yearly constitutions, wholesale proscriptions, political experiments without number. The common man had now a hundred avenues of opportunity open to him, of escape from a hemming and stifling feudalism, of elevation into a higher and more independent sphere of energy. The monotonous life of the remote castle took on color and variety. Everywhere the vivifying current of commerce cut a channel for itself. European mankind had burst the bonds of its swaddling clothes, saw and measured with eagerness the great world, and recognized the fulness and glory of its new opportunities.

The first progress of mediæval medicine and constitutional law is closely related to these great movements of mankind to the East. Out of them came the first conscious lay attempts at a civil government based on written law—the feudal states of Syria. Almost the first written codes of mediæval law are the Assizes of Jerusalem, a formally excogitated and guaranteed legislation for all classes. Commercial law that had made little progress since the code of Amalfi,

was reduced to writing and to a system. Maritime and military law, the old imperial traditions and the valuable experience of Constantinople, asserted themselves—in a word, the Crusades were the first great school of general and common civilized life for all the nations of Europe.²

Not only did they increase the knowledge of the world and widen the horizon of learning—they brought out very high qualities of moral life. Personality asserted itself very strongly, given the weakness of authority and the countless new perils of these enterprises. If monk and priest were zealous and eloquent, the baron and his men were heroic and enduring. A new public consciousness was aroused, and there dawned on the humblest mind the possibility of what a united Christendom could do. Nations were drawn together very closely, in their own ranks first, and then between one another. Europe had never before been solidary in any enterprise. The wealth and elegance of Moslem society impressed the Crusaders, as also did the polish and culture of Constantinople and its Greek society. One was infidel and the other schismatic, yet daily contact with both begot more liberal and tolerant relations. The elements of common humanity asserted themselves in diplomacy and hospitality, in ransom and truce and single combat; the courteous and enlightened toleration of modern society is all in germ in the mediæval Crusades. Men hate one another, says Silvio Pellico, only because they do not know one another.

² It used to be the fashion to regard the Crusades as mere fantastic exhibitions of a temporary turbulent religious fanaticism, aiming at ends wholly visionary, and missing them, wasting the best life of Europe in colossal and bloody undertakings, and leaving effects only of evil for the time which came after. More reasonable views now prevail; and while the impulse in which the vast movement took its rise is recognized as passionate and semi-barbaric, it is seen that many effects followed which were beneficent rather than harmful, which could not perhaps have been at the time in other ways realized. As I have already suggested, properties were to an important extent redistributed in Europe, and the constitution of states was favorably effected. Lands were sold at low prices by those who were going on the distant expeditions, very probably, as they knew, never to return; and horses and armor, with all martial equipments, were bought at high prices by those who were to need them on the march and in battle. Even the Jews who could not hold land, and the history of whom throughout the Middle Ages is commonly to be traced in fearful lines of blood and fire, increased immeasurably their movable wealth through these transfers of property. Communes bought liberties by large contributions to the needs of their lord; and their liberties once secured, were naturally confirmed and augmented, as the years went on. The smaller tended to be absorbed in the larger; the larger often to come more strictly under royal control, thus increasing the power of the sovereign—which meant at the time, general laws, instead of local, a less minutely oppressive administration, the furtherance of the movement toward national unity. It is a noticeable fact that Italy took but a small part, comparatively, in the Crusades; and the long postponement of organic unions between different parts of the magnificent peninsula is not without relation to this. The influence which operated elsewhere in Europe to efface distinctions of custom and language in separate communities, to override and extinguish local animosities, to make scattered peoples conscious of kinship, did not operate there; and the persistent severance of sections from each other, favored of course by the run of the rivers and the vast separating walls of the Apennines, was the natural consequence of the want of this powerful unifying force.—Storrs, "Bernard of Clairvaux," New York (Scribner's), 1897, pp. 544-45.

In these two centuries, therefore, the world of Europe expanded mightily and organically. The once barbarian Germanic people, educated in their infancy by the Catholic Church, broke the bonds of serf-like dependency, cast aside their primitive narrow feudalism and could in time become the great states of Europe. They went forth, sword in hand, across land and sea, in pursuit of a high spiritual ideal, and while they did not realize it, nevertheless it drew them like a star, to great heights of personal endeavor and social achievement. Fine qualities of mind and heart were developed in these enterprises that partook at once of the conquests of an Alexander and the results of Colonization. The cycle of social life was immeasurably enlarged. Politeness established its reign with the elevation of woman, that came through the church, and the institutions of chivalry. The arts and sciences of the Greek Orient and the Moslem world, were made known to Europe. Literature found new models, new ideals and aspirations; the singers of the people new notes, new themes, new passions. Industry and commerce were admitted as factors in the new States of Europe and the Orient. All the factors that were to bring about the creation of modern society, with the exception of the latest inventions, were then planted on the soil of Europe. Unity, assimilation, progress, go back to these great displacements of European humanity. No doubt there was much injustice, much crime and human folly—but wars have their civilizing and humanizing functions, as well as peace. They are often unavoidable and they have their allotted place in the divine plan that surely governs the world of men and things. Though we may never again see a United Christendom, it will always be a consolation to every adorer of Jesus Christ that for one brief hour in the history of Western humanity His Cross dominated all social life, drew to it every class of men, shone resplendent and humanizing in the zenith of public life, affected all legislation and human development, impressed its spiritual meaning on millions of hearts, and seemed like the holy aurora of the long sighed for millenium.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

CATHOLIC DEMOCRACY.

I HAVE not chosen the title of Professor Nitti's interesting work on "Catholic Socialism"¹ to designate the important movement among Catholics on the Continent of which it treats—the attempt to deal on Christian principles with the abuses of modern capitalism, and the grievances of the laboring classes. The name "Catholic Socialism" is really misleading; for opposition to the principles of continental Socialism is a main feature of the programme in most cases. Still, the fact that the movement of which I am going to speak has strenuously opposed the extreme individualism of the liberal economics explains, if it does not justify, Professor Nitti's use of the term. I propose to give an outline of the Catholic social movement in France, Switzerland, Germany, and Austria, and briefly to consider some of the principles it has involved, and the action of Leo the Thirteenth in its regard. Besides Professor Nitti's work I shall avail myself of Grégoire's *Le Pape, les Catholiques et la Question sociale*, and of various fugitive essays and papers by recent students of the question.²

In France the movement has been, and still is, associated closely with the name of Count Albert de Mun. Together with his friend La Tour du Pin Chambly, Comte de Mun was taken prisoner during the war of 1870. During their captivity the two friends read together Emile Keller's work on the Encyclical of 1864 and the principles of 1789. This encyclical, which was published with the Syllabus, was, as we remember, mainly a protest against the revolutionary principles adopted by modern society, and the indiscriminate Liberalism which was the gospel of the civilized world at that time. Pius the Ninth protested in both documents against the exaggerated *cultus* of the modern "liberties," and maintained that true liberty was to be found, not in unrestricted freedom for the individual, but in wise protective legislation by Church and State for the general good of society. At a time when free trade, free speech, free association, a free press, free contract, the automatic working of the laws of supply and demand, were regarded as the panacea for all evils, this protest was received by the irreligious press as the supreme act of dotage on the part of the Papacy, and its final divorce from the modern world. De Mun was not in love with the modern world. He and his friend returned to France in '71 and helped to put down

¹ "Catholic Socialism," by Francesco S. Nitti, Professor of Political Economy at the University of Naples. Translated, with an introduction, by Professor David G. Ritchie. Swan Sonnenschein & Co., London, 1895.

² I may name especially some valuable private notes by Mr. C. S. Devas on some aspects of the movement in France and Germany.

the Commune. They saw in the Commune an object lesson in the results of the principles of the Revolution. The conservative reaction which led Frenchmen to welcome the Marshalate, took an acute and special form in Albert de Mun. The spectacles of carnage and starvation which the Commune presented, gave him at once deep sympathy with the oppressed, and a strong sense that revolutionary principles led to a form of that very tyranny against which the Revolution had protested. A born philanthropist, Albert de Mun found himself on Christmas night 1871 discussing the question of the hour at a workman's club founded by M. Maignan. Then and there they decided to extend the institution. Its object was that workmen should themselves study the social question under the ægis of religion and wise direction; that they should avoid a repetition of the awful irony of the Revolution, of success in securing a remedy which led back to a new form of the disease. The Utopian hopes which had been dissipated by the Commune, were to be replaced by aiming at a system which would at least secure religion and order—a monarchy which had learnt its lesson and would respect the just claims of the working classes. Royalism and the extreme Ultramontaniam of the Syllabus seem at first sight to have little in common with a democratic movement; yet they were the inspiring motives of Albert de Mun's *Œuvre des cercles*, the first-fruits of the modern Catholic democracy in France.

In ten years, according to the testimony of Mr. Kaufman, the clubs belonging to the *Œuvre* movement had reached the number of 450, and it was decided to admit to membership besides workmen themselves, others who subscribed to the programme of the institution. While the *Œuvre* extended itself, its economic programme gradually became more thorough and definite. Its council devoted itself to serious study, the results of which were published periodically in its organ, *L'Association catholique*; and such a non-Catholic economical authority as M. Benedict, the Socialist, in the *Revue socialiste* of 1885, recognized emphatically the value of its contributions to the problem. It should be added that the *Œuvre* did not continue to be royalist in its aspirations, and eventually "rallied" to the Republic.

More venturesome economic speculations led to some discontent with the limited results of the *Œuvre*. De Mun came to advocate a total restoration of something like the old Guild system. In March 1884 he helped in passing a Bill that, for the first time in the present century, allowed liberty to workmen's associations. But De Mun's proposals to give them special privileges were rejected, and, in fact, they have developed slowly and their members number only 3 per cent. of the million Frenchmen now joined in syndicates of which the

two chief and rapidly growing forms, each with between four and five hundred thousand members, are the *syndicats ouvriers*, or trades unions, that may be well regarded with anxiety, and the *syndicats agricoles*, or rural associations, that may be well regarded with satisfaction. In 1888 de Mun proposed a scheme of State intervention so elaborate that Mgr. Freppel (Bishop of Angers), who had supported the Bill of 1884, drew back, saying that he would have neither State Socialism nor Church Socialism.

The origin of the Catholic democratic movement in Switzerland presents points of marked contrast with France. The French movement was instituted by a nobleman, the Swiss by a man of the people, Dr. Gaspard Decurtins. De Mun was a man of action before he became a student; a religious student before he became an economist or a popular leader. Decurtins began his studies at seventeen, read the fathers and the Socialists; and emerged from his reading a devout Catholic, and an implacable enemy of the liberal economic principles, before he became a man of action at all. Again, from his antecedents and character he had the power of winning the confidence of a popular audience. De Mun's best speeches (it was said) were those which ended with the words, "go to the people;" but actually to go to them and to influence them was the office for which Decurtins was especially fitted. De Mun's *Œuvre*, moreover, was confined to Catholics. Decurtins, living in a country where creeds are divided, worked in company with Protestants. De Mun's actual achievement was most successful in the formation of workmen's clubs and corporations. He effected comparatively little in the direction of legislation. Decurtins, on the contrary, achieved most in actual remedial legislation, and in enabling the workman to gain the ear of the Government for his grievances. "In no country," says M. Grégoire, "has legislation on behalf of the workman advanced so rapidly as in Switzerland," and to the initiative of Decurtins that legislation was largely due. He instituted, in concert with more advanced Socialists, the *Secrétariat ouvrier*, an office of statistics, whose officials are elected by the workingmen's societies, and which acts as intermediary between the Government and the laboring classes—laying before the Executive their grievances and their complaints against public functionaries. Those who wish to know the exact scope of the legislation on behalf of the laborer in Switzerland should consult the work of M. Gay, *La législation ouvrière en Suisse*.

It was Decurtins who first successfully conceived the plan of international action on the social question, to be inaugurated with the approval of the various European Governments. In 1887 he broached the question in the Swiss Parliament. In 1888 the Par-

liament ratified his proposal. An International Congress was fixed to take place at Berne in the following year. By Emperor William's desire it was transferred to Berlin. If the Congress did not decide much, it inaugurated a movement. It marked the recognition by the various States represented, of the principle of international action and legislation on the labor question. It was succeeded by others. At a subsequent Congress at Bienne in 1893 Decurtins won another point in the direction of gaining the sanction of religion and authority for the international movement. A mixed assemblage of members, of different nationalities and of many creeds and no creed, passed a resolution in favor of Leo the Thirteenth's encyclical on the labor question—the *Rerum novarum*—and obtained from the Pope a letter addressed to Decurtins (dated August 6, 1893), in which, though silent as to the extent of State interference desirable, he favored the genral idea of international legislation on behalf of the workman.

The action of Pope and Emperor in favor of international legislation on the social question leads me naturally to consider the history of the Catholic democratic movement in Germany itself. With the work of Bishop Ketteler in the fifties, in arousing from his pulpit at Mainz a sense of the reality of the social problem and of the hardships of the workingman, my readers are probably familiar. He was the great pioneer. The men of the German Centre who developed the movement—Canons Moufang and Hitze—received their impulse from Ketteler. The story of its progress runs parallel to the story of Bismarck's war to the knife with what he used to term the "black international" and the "red international."

The "red international" was Bismarck's name for modern Socialism. The "black international" was the Catholic and Roman Church. Both these two powers were at one time or another objects of his relentless hostility. The Catholic population of the German Empire is not much more (according to Réclus) than one-half the Protestant population. But German Catholicism has been singularly vigorous since the great revival which dates from 1837. After Bismarck's determined attempt to break its power by the Falk laws of 1873, he came in the end to think that the "red international" was a greater danger to the State than the "black;" that the friendship of the "black" was necessary for effective opposition to the "red." With the courage of a really strong man Bismarck promptly translated his changed convictions into action. The policy of the *Kulturkampf* was reversed. His saying, "We are not going to Canossa," was no longer insisted on. The Falk laws were one after another repealed.

It was in 1878 that this change in Bismarck's policy became in-

evitable. Socialism had been assuming a more menacing aspect for upwards of a year, and in May and June came the two attempts, of Hodel and Nobiling, to assassinate the Emperor. A month later saw the general elections, and the Catholic Centre not only came in in increased numbers, but the whole compact party of National Liberals was broken up into almost equal groups of Imperialists and National Liberals. The Catholics held the balance of power and were masters of the situation. They had steadily gained in popularity among the masses, largely owing to their democratic programme, of which Ketteler's disciple, Canon Moufang, was at that time the most influential exponent. And now it was clear that instead of breaking their power, the Falk laws had increased it; while instead of being the natural allies of the Government, which was trembling in fear of a revolution, they were, by the Government's own persistent persecution, its avowed enemies.

Meanwhile a new Pope had come, free from the specially bitter personal memories which had led Pius the Ninth to an irreversible policy of *Non possumus*. Bismarck approached Leo the Thirteenth in 1879 on the subject of a modification of the Falk laws. Nothing seemed to come of it. But in February 1880, the Pope publicly urged the Archbishop of Cologne to submit the names of priests to Government before instituting them. The new importance of the Catholic vote in the Reichstag was an additional motive for prompt acceptance of the Pope's olive branch. The Falk laws were modified in the same year. Further modifications followed in 1883 and 1884; and in 1885 came the interesting spectacle of the Protestant Chancellor inviting the Pope to assume the mediæval rôle of international arbiter between Spain and Germany in the dispute about the Caroline Islands. The islands were awarded to Spain with the due protection of German interests, and the order of Christ was bestowed on Prince Bismarck.

This sequence of events was closely allied with the progress of the Catholic democratic movement in Germany. As early as 1871—before the passing of the Falk laws—Baron von Schorlemer Alst had so far organized his Westphalian Bauernverein—an association of landholders, large and small—that they used their newly won franchise with great effect against the Government candidates, and the association was forcibly dissolved by Bismarck. It was, however, reconstituted under a new name. And in the critical years between the passing of the Falk laws in 1873 and the Socialist attempts on the Emperor's life in 1878, the popular programme of the Catholic party was one great secret of its strength. "Thanks to its social programme," writes M. Grégoire, "the centre party was able to maintain its struggle with the Government. When, on the other

hand, Socialism became in Germany the great subject of alarm, the Government naturally made approaches to the Centre, which alone, thanks to the same programme, was able to resist Socialism with some chance of success."³

Now, it is important to note that in Germany, and still more in Austria, the Catholic democratic movement was not a popular one in the same sense as it was in Switzerland and in France, and largely in Belgium and in America. Both in Germany and in Austria the mediæval guilds had only recently been deprived of their privileges—by the laws of 1868 in Prussia and of 1871 in Germany; while in Austria they had been abolished in 1859. Again the special class antagonism in Germany and Austria was not that hatred of the old aristocracy, which had been so potent among French working men at the time of the Revolution; but a hatred, in which many noblemen were united with the people, of the modern plutocracy as represented by the Jews. The movement was largely anti-Semitic.

Of practical workers among the people none have been more active or effectual than Baron von Schorlemer Alst, already alluded to as founder of the Westphalian Bauernverein. This great association grew in 1868 out of a number of smaller ones, each founded by a landed proprietor or large farmer. Baron Felix von Loe in 1877 instituted a society of popular economy. This was in 1882 transformed into the Rheinische Bauernverein, which, like the Westphalian, numbers over 20,000 members.

There are also Bavarian Bauernvereine numbering 12,000 members in 1895, Silesian, 8,500; in Nassau over 3,000; in Baden 4,000; and others in Arn and the Eichsfeld district.

The general condition of membership in these associations is two-fold: first to be a landholder, whether large proprietor, yeoman, peasant, or tenant farmer; and secondly to be a good Christian. The Lutheran farmers, therefore, are equally admissible with the Catholics; still, it is principally the Catholic districts of Germany that are the seats of the Bauernvereine. The work done is of many kinds, for example, insurance against fire and hail, life insurance, joint purchase of artificial manures and agricultural machinery, joint sale of agricultural produce, coöperative savings banks and lending banks on the Raiffeisen principle, spread of information useful to farmers by means of the newspaper of the association, prevention of disputes by a board of conciliation, and legal advice and support.

Not less important than these rural societies are those for town workers, which have grown up *pari passu* with the transformation of the old ways of industry. The first was to meet the needs of a class, still important in Germany, the *Gesellen* or journeymen, young men

³ "Grégoire, pp. 10, 11.

from the age of seventeen onwards, who had finished their apprenticeship and were traveling, as the custom was, through Germany, to grow perfect in their trade, staying longer or shorter at different places according to circumstances. The old bonds having been broken by which the masters in *la petite industrie* were almost like fathers to their journeymen, the demoralization of the latter was great, until Father Kolping, who had himself in his youth been a journeyman tailor, founded at Elberfeld in 1846 the admirable Gesellenvereine, providing these young workmen with a decent home, decent companions and recreation, education, religious, general and technical, information enabling them to obtain work, help in distress, and means to reach another town where a similar centre and home would be found. At Kolping's death in 1865 these associations had spread over Germany and had become the model for analogous institutions among the Protestants. At present in the German Empire the members of the Catholic Gesellenvereine number some 75,000.

But other classes of workpeople were growing in importance and were not provided for by the journeymen's associations. Hence, in the sixties, a number of Catholic associations grew up under various names, often taking the Gesellenvereine as their model. A great development and union of these seemed imminent in 1869 after the Bishops' Conference at Fulda and under the leadership of Von Ketteler, the bishop of Mayence. But this development was arrested by the Falk laws, and not until they had been abrogated could it be resumed. Thenceforth the interrupted work of Catholic association has gone rapidly forward. The "Union of Catholic Manufacturers and Friends of the Workpeople" was founded in 1881 under the title of Arbeiterwohl, with an admirable journal of the same name; Franz Brandt being president, and Abbé Hitze, the able democratic member of the Reichstag, secretary. The members bind themselves to promote the good of the workingman, and respect his interests. Claudio Jannet could well speak of it as one of the great forces of Catholic Germany. This association among the upper classes has fostered the growth of associations among the workpeople, till now in the German Empire there are some 300 of them under the title of Catholic Workmen's Unions (*Katholische Arbeitervereine*) with some 80,000 members, quite distinct from the Gesellenvereine already mentioned, as well as from other Catholic associations for working boys and apprentices, factory girls, shop women, and domestic servants.

It would carry me too far to describe the efforts of the two priests, Moufang and Hitze, in the Reichstag to plead the cause of the workingman. The aim of Hitze was the social organization of

trades by means of compulsory industrial corporations—a far wider and more revolutionary conception than the Catholic corporations already in existence. Free Catholic corporations, or at most free corporations of mixed confessions, were all that was contemplated as possible by such moderate members of the Centre as Windhorst. Hitze worked so successfully that in 1888 several important Bills for the protection of labor and in the direction of State organization of industry passed the Reichstag. A panic ensued in the manufacturing class, and the measures were bodily rejected by the Bundesrath. Hitze, however—whom the fall of Bismarck and the death of Windhorst, the head of the Centre party, made a very prominent person in the Reichstag—has continued to urge his ideas on his fellow countrymen, and has been made by the present Emperor a member of the Council of the State.

But the Christian democrats of Germany originated a yet more potent movement among their neighbors in Austria. In the year in which Bismarck's alarm at the growth of Socialism was first aroused—1877—Dr. Rudolph Meyer, a Prussian, published a work called *Politische Gründe und die Corruption in Deutschland*. His work was an outspoken attack on the Government, and Meyer was forced to fly the country. He fled to Austria and became one of the founders of the Catholic democratic movement there, though he himself remained a Protestant. Another Prussian, Baron Karl von Vogelsang, converted in early years to Catholicism, was a yet more influential leader in Austria.

In Austria the movement was, as I have already said, essentially anti-Semitic, and feudal and aristocratic in its ideal, and in the persons of its promoters. Anti-Semitism is a powerful force in Germany; but in Austria it became something like a passion or a panic. The Jews in Austria and Hungary enjoy an almost exclusive monopoly of industrial revenue. The press, the banks, the Stock Exchange are in their hands. They hold themselves apart from the rest of the population. Their gradual absorption of economic territory has been accompanied by a growth in numbers. Professor Nitti estimates that between 1869 and 1888—a period of nineteen years—they increased at the rate of 27 per cent. while the rest of the population has increased only at the rate of 77 per cent. Territorially also their power has steadily increased. The Rothschilds alone possess a fourth part of the Bohemian territory, *i. e.* seven times more than the Imperial family. It is maintained that this increase of wealth and power on the part of the Jews has not been accompanied by any attempt on their part to improve the condition of the laboring classes. A recent inquiry has shown that throughout the empire the workmen are treated with special severity and exploited with avidity by the Jewish inhabitants and proprietors.

Naturally on many grounds the growth of Jewish influence was unwelcome to the clergy. Thus, the people, many of the old aristocracy—whose wealth and influence were being usurped—and the clergy, have been united in hatred of the Jews. It is easy, then, to understand that a movement against the encroachments of these hated capitalists was taken up with keenness and energy.

Vogelsang, who achieved such marked success in the movement, urged his ideas in the journal called the *Vaterland* and in his own paper *Monatschrift für christliche social Reform*. His point of departure was opposition to the liberalism of the Revolution of '48, which had done for Austria what the great Revolution did for France. The comparative recency of the Revolution gave force to his claim that his programme was essentially conservative, having for its aim the restoration of the feudal principles displaced in 1848. He maintained that the old order rested on the principle that property was given to individuals in exchange for their performance of certain duties to the community. The King himself held his territory and received homage in consideration of the performance of his duties as legislator for the common good, and as the representative of his country in its international relations. The old feudal nobility supplied soldiers for a war; were guardians of order in their own district; protected the interests of their own tenants. The old guilds organized the various trades and protected the interests of the craftsman. These institutions had gradually degenerated, and the sentiment of rights had replaced that of duties. But instead of effecting the desired reform—of enforcing by law duties which those in high station had come to neglect—the Revolution simply dissolved the social organism, and substituted for the old collection of more or less autonomous bodies an omnipotent State bureaucracy. It left the real evil untouched; and private property continued to be a luxury entailing no duties whatever, and benefiting only its possessor. The Revolution was the abolition of the old order and the triumph of the bureaucracy and of capitalism. Industry, instead of tending towards national prosperity, now subserved the interests only of the capitalists. The remedy must lie in the revival of the old feudal relations between the upper classes and their dependents, and the reestablishment of something like the old guilds on a solid foundation as a check on the tyranny of capitalism. These corporations were to be autonomous bodies with legal and personal rights, and under the supervision of the State.

Vogelsang and his friends urged this programme by two methods—in Parliament and by Catholic congresses. Prince Lichtenstein was their principal spokesman in the Reichstag. Their first great victory in Parliament was the passing of the Bill in 1883 restoring

the corporations of trades in Austria, so far as the *petite industrie* was concerned, with further license to restore the district corporations of large industries. In 1884 a similar measure was passed in reference to Hungary. In March 1885 a law was enacted fixing eleven hours as a maximum day's work, and limiting the labor of women and children.

The work of restoring and reorganizing the corporations in the end proved slow and difficult. It was promoted by successive congresses, notably by that of 1890, in which twenty-three bishops and 600 priests took part. The Jesuit, Father Kolb, the Dominican Father, Albert Weiss, and Herr Eichorn, a priest and a deputy in the Reichstag, have been among the most vigorous workers. Among the members of the old aristocracy who have followed Baron Vogelsang's lead are, besides Prince Lichtenstein already mentioned, Count Blöme, Count Kuefstein, and Count Belcredi.

It should be added that, although the Catholic Popular party has perhaps more nearly approached socialistic principles in Austria than elsewhere, Vogelsang very strongly opposed any movement in the direction of land-nationalization. "However advanced my conceptions may appear," he said, "they have no other basis but the old Christian civilization of the Western races. I am the declared enemy of the all-powerfulness of the State, of the Byzantine smothering of every liberty, of all intellectual life which would result from Nationalization of the land." But he added emphatically that the intervention of the Church was not enough without that of the State and of Christian laws.

John Stuart Mill, in a posthumous fragment on Socialism, remarked that whereas all Socialist writers were more or less agreed as to the social evils which they wished to see remedied, scarcely any two of them could agree as to the proposed remedy. The same remark applies to the Catholic social movement.

It will be, however, possible to classify certain solutions proposed; and from the classification some useful results may be obtained.

The most thorough and philosophical basis for the whole movement was supplied by a man who was also historically one of its originators in France and Belgium, M. Leplay. A disciple of Bonald, who, with De Maistre, was one of the founders of the modern French Ultramontane school, he developed Bonald's philosophy on that side which relates to the social problem. Bonald had severely criticized the individualism of the eighteenth-century sceptics. He appealed to the universal immemorial beliefs of society as embodying both the primitive revelation and the experience of the race—to customs and traditions having that claim to authority which consisted in the fact that they had kept society together in the past. He justified religious faith against the negative criticism of

the individual sceptic on this ground. Leplay took up a similar position in the department where it was logically strongest—on purely social questions. Those conditions which were found by the experience of mankind to have actually led to social order and prosperity are thereby justified. But, with more caution than Bonald, he based his argument on a strictly inductive scientific process. Such speculations as those of St. Simon were, he maintained, mere exercises of the imagination. Theories like his, if carried out, were daring experiments on the body politic; and the results of an unsuccessful experiment were too awful for a wise statesman to risk. What was the issue of 1793 but the outcome of acting out hitherto untested social theories? Rather it behooves us, he maintained, by the strictly inductive method to study forms of society now existing and existing in the past, and from such observation to ascertain the causes of actual economic and social prosperity on the one hand and disaster on the other. In his travels as Professor of Metallurgy in the French University, as general inspector of mines, and in other departments, he had ample opportunities for observation. The accuracy of his personal observation is generally considered to be greater than the accuracy of his generalizations from history. He was deeply impressed by the fact that candid and close observation shows that at every turn the success of social experiments hinges on religion. "Social science," he writes, "leads its true observers constantly back to the principles of the Divine law." Though a Catholic, he was not, when he wrote his great work *La Reforme sociale*, closely associated with the Clerical party. He dwells more on the Decalogue and the Sermon on the Mount as forces to be applied in solving the social problem than on the work of the existing ecclesiastical organizations. Towards the end of his life, however, he wrote a letter of filial devotion to Leo the Thirteenth.

His studies appear to have convinced him that the subtle causes at work in social life could not be wholly reduced to an exact science. His advocacy of *patronat libre*—the voluntary exercise of the patriarchal virtues on the part of employers and landowners—as the best solution of the problem is an instance of this fact. It was largely an appeal to personal wisdom and benevolence rather than to a scientifically defined method. So, too, with his doctrine of "social authorities" and the "hierarchy of authorities." Those who had proved actually successful in organizing happy and prosperous communities became "authorities." Their methods should be imitated. They had the force of an empirical law, where the final conditions of success could not be fully traced. He called his theory the theory of "imitation," as distinguished from the theories of "invention" characteristic of modern Socialism. Such theories are utterly reck-

less, in the department of social science, of that law of induction—of ascertaining causes from observation of actual facts and experienced results—which has been one secret of success in physical science.

He advocates, then, the introduction into social science of some of the methods of physical science. But there is one important exception. Whereas constant experiment is an additional factor of importance in physical research—for if an experiment fails no harm is done, if it succeeds it means a step forward—he reiterates what Bonald had already said, that a rash experiment may be fatal in the social order. It may break up the existing organism of society, which cannot afterwards be pieced together again.

It is, then, the actual carrying into action of those conditions and dispositions which have made industrious, thrifty, and happy communities in the past, which will lead to social progress. It is not the discovery of new principles, but the selection of those old ones which have actually succeeded, and the carrying them systematically into action, that is wanted. “La réforme des mœurs n’est point subordonnée à l’invention de nouvelles doctrines,” he writes, “car l’esprit de l’innovation est aussi stérile dans l’ordre moral qu’il est fécond dans l’ordre matériel.”

Leplay thus regarded the problem as wholly a moral problem. The “patron” or employer has, according to him, lost the old Christian conception of his position. This is the root of the evil. If the idea of family life died out and children were generally ill-treated, starved, left in ignorance by their parents, you could not satisfactorily remedy the evil by legislation. No law elastic or subtle enough to match the loving care of a rightly disposed father and mother could be found. The remedy would lie in restoring to parents the lost sentiment of parental duty. So the remedy for the Labor difficulty lies in restoring the idea of the duties of the *patron*.

Those who developed Leplay’s views in various directions laid perhaps greater stress than he did on the economic side of the question. And they acted in closer union with ecclesiastical authority. They were for the most part strong opponents of the Liberal economics. They argued against the fatalistic worship of freedom on the part of Liberals which led even our own John Bright to oppose the Factory Acts. Free contract between the wealthy and the starving, and free competition between the strong and the weak, were, they held, a *reductio ad absurdum* of the promised golden age which all the freedoms were to bring. Some social force to protect the helpless laborer—an impotent unit at the mercy of the capitalist—must be devised. So far there was agreement. But what force? Here began disagreement.

Some form of corporation was advocated by all. That corpora-

tions were to be largely under the influence of religion and the guidance of the Church—this again was a unanimous opinion.

But the specification of particulars led to divisions. Are the corporations to consist of workmen only, like our own trades unions, or are employers and workmen to combine? Are the organizations to be voluntary or enforced by law? Are they to be of Catholics only, or is each trade to form an industrial corporation of all its members, Catholic and non-Catholic alike? Are they to agitate forthwith for Labor laws? for State regulation of a minimum wage and a maximum day's work? for the Sunday rest? for the protection of women and children workers? Is the law to interfere in the regulation of the various industries? Is the State to regulate distribution? Here are some of the questions on which there seems hopeless variety of opinion, though perhaps the variety is in some cases more in appearance than in reality.

The most thorough-going and drastic policy has been adopted by the Catholics of Austria. Meyer's programme aimed at the State regulation of distribution and of industrial production, with a view to the collective interests of society; a minimum wage and maximum day; the establishment of State coöperative stores. In the region of practical politics Baron Vogelsang worked to secure compulsory industrial corporations. The Catholic party, under his guidance, have been drawing out a programme which would make fundamental changes in the Constitution. They carried, as we have seen, in 1883, a law which, under the plea for a conservative revival of the old guilds, introduced compulsory corporation in the *petite industrie*; and they proposed a change in the system of parliamentary representation which should ensure direct representation in Parliament of the various industrial interests. Count Blöme, in his speech at the Jubilee of Baron Vogelsang in 1888, drew a picture of the Reichstag of the future, where "we should no longer speak as at present of the member for Vienna, but the member for the *petite industrie* at Vienna, and the member for the Bourse at Vienna." The new corporations necessarily include Catholic and non-Catholic alike. Their establishment was an infraction of individual liberty on the part of the State, which made many Catholics fear that the thin end of the wedge of State Socialism was being introduced. Vogelsang and his friends also succeeded in obtaining important laws protecting the workmen, and they joined Decurtins in Switzerland in his advocacy of international legislation on the labor question.

At the opposite pole stands M. Léon Harmel, at the Val des Bois in Champagne. A practical man, himself a large employer of labor, he has advocated and carried out successfully a system of corpora-

tion based fundamentally on religious influences, voluntary in its origin, composed exclusively of Catholics, independent of State interference, claiming only a minimum of State recognition and support. Although he attaches more value to organization than Leplay does, he agrees with Leplay largely in believing that the necessary machinery is dependant at any time on certain moral dispositions and moral causes.

And in Leplay's "hierarchy of authorities" Harmel, from his marked success, should hold a high position. At the root of his whole system is the view that only community of aim among masters and men can make an experiment successful, and that that aim can only be obtained by the active application of religious principle. In the following remarkable passages he condemns beforehand as impracticable the far-reaching scheme of compulsory guilds made up of persons of all creeds.

We will not on any account accept the compulsory guilds [he wrote in the *Association catholique des Patrons du Nord*], because the combining of unequal and frequently opposed elements can only, from the moral point of view, produce disastrous effects. Those who would build in company must first of all speak the same language. Now, Catholics and freethinkers have an entirely different language: the first call honor that which the others term cowardice, the second call liberty what the others consider as slavery; the former are ready to give their life for their duty, while the latter hold rebellion as the first of duties. On all arguments concerning virtue, probity, disinterestedness, the origin and aim of life, they each speak a separate language. How, then, could they act in concert in reconstructing a moral fabric which demands unity and community of effect?

Again, he writes in his *Manuel d'une Corporation chrétienne*:

The social question is not only a question of food, clothing and lodging; it is above all a question of peace of heart. What matters most is not that the workman be richer or poorer, but that he be content with his lot. And while we see social peace reigning in localities where the wages are at the lowest rate, agitation and discontent frequently give rise to conflicts among populations enjoying much higher wages.

Harmel's scheme—of which I say no more, as its general features are well known—has found many imitators. And his corporation is affiliated to the Comte de Mun's *Œuvre des cercles*.

Between the Austrian extreme of compulsory guilds comprising members of the different religious confessions, and Harmel's free Catholic corporations, suggestive of the all-pervading religious life of mediæval times, there are many intermediate schemes more or less fully realized.

What has been Leo the Thirteenth's attitude in view of all these currents of opinion? It cannot be doubted that Leo the Thirteenth has long had a special sympathy with all active endeavor to improve the condition of the working man, provided such endeavor is not subversive of social order, and that he regards the modern tyranny of the capitalist as revolting to the sense of justice, and not as a necessary evil. In a remarkable pastoral written in 1877, before he

was Pope, he spoke bitterly of the modern capitalist who regarded his workman as a "machine," and maintained that the abuses in question which claimed to be a part of modern "progress" were in reality "driving us many centuries back to those sad times when so great a part of the human race lay crushed in slavery, and of which the poet sorrowfully cried, "The human race lives only in a few" (*"Humanum paucis vivit genus"*).

That very year the Pontiff was reminded that action on behalf of the suffering was rendered most difficult by the programme of the Nihilistic Socialists. The assassination of King Humbert and the attempt on the life of Emperor William, the rise of Nihilistic societies in Italy, with such names as *La Mano Nera*, *La Dinamita*, *Morte ai Borghesi*, meant the growth of an anarchic spirit which would make the best economic reforms useless, and any attempts to change the established order dangerous. The Encyclical of 1878 denounced Socialism in the strongest terms.

However, time went on and the danger lessened. The Catholic democratic movement, which I have sketched, took form in Switzerland and in Austria in the succeeding years. In France and Germany it grew in influence at the same time. It sent its addresses of deep loyalty to the Holy See. In response came sympathetic though guarded expressions of approval, until in 1891 the *Rerum novarum* gave a full statement of the Holy Father's position.

We know that the encyclical *Rerum novarum*, though it unquestionably shows his deep interest in the labor question, has been claimed as justifying their own views by both extreme parties—the democrats and the advocates of the existing order, who would invoke no remedy beyond an exhortation to philanthropy and almsgiving. The text of the encyclical is before every one, and to examine to any purpose the disputed passages would carry me too far.

But to my mind the lessons of the encyclical are independent of these disputes. It can hardly be doubted by a careful reader of the encyclical that one of its primary lessons is that a practical scheme of economics is inseparable from ethics, that economic legislation is a branch of practical ethics. The great fact which Leplay learnt from years of practical experiment and study is recognized by the Pope. But in place of stopping at the Decalogue and Sermon on the Mount as the instruments of ethical reform, Leo the Thirteenth takes the existing organization of the Church as the engine for enforcing on employers and employed alike the necessary virtues. And yet there is no pretense in the encyclical of *substituting* a sermon in place of practical action. It is rather a recognition that in the working of any economical machinery, the soundness of the ethical

wheels and chains is among the most important conditions of its running smoothly or continuing to run at all.

To profess to make the whole matter one for economics apart from ethics is to forget that all legislation for human beings presupposes as necessary links in the successful working of the system a number of ethical conditions. When an oath on the Gospels is regarded by law as ensuring veracious testimony, the legislation presupposes such a belief in the Bible as makes such an oath practically binding. A Mahometan would substitute the Koran. Should faith in a future life be weakened, the resulting weakness of the practical efficiency of the oath might have to be compensated by increasing the penalties for perjury. If the Austrian Catholic Socialists are right in supposing that the old feudal system in its palmy days secured protection for the vassal by his lord, it was largely in virtue of an ethical standard of *noblesse oblige*, which the aristocracy of the last century had lost. Remedial legislation is constantly based upon the existence of an impaired moral standard. We take precautions in a crowded town against dishonest practices which are unknown to the better country villages. Mill has well remarked that the best system of laws cannot be worked if judges and juries are open to corruption and witnesses perjure themselves. However indefinable and impalpable they may be in some cases, moral dispositions are among the most important factors in any system which regulates the conduct of human beings. No mere rules of school discipline could have effected the reform of Rugby which Dr. Arnold brought about by the moral elevation he imparted to the school by means chiefly of his personal influence on the monitors. Probably the system of M. Léon Harmel, on which economists dwell as a successful experiment in economics, owes just those characteristics which were decisive as to its success largely to conditions which are ethical rather than purely economical, to Harmel's own personal qualities, and to the religious loyal spirit which his own example has imparted.

The Pope throughout his encyclical recognizes the importance of the ethical factors, and it is in consequence of this recognition that he sees no royal road to a solution of the question by economics apart from religion, or by any cut and dried theory apart from the actual exercise of certain virtues on both sides.

Where the all-important ethical basis can be established Leo the Thirteenth is largely in sympathy with the actual programme of some of the Catholic democrats. This is beyond question, from the text of the encyclical and from his words, far exceeding a merely general and vague sympathy, to M. Harmel. In the encyclical he distinctly approves of workmen's associations, and of institutions which draw *patron* and artisan together, of benefit societies, and of

industrial organizations of employers and employed. Moreover, though discouraging as a rule the attempt to invoke the interference of the State, he does advocate it in pressing and extreme cases of injustice.⁴ With regard to the organization at Val des Bois, it is on record that on occasion of an audience accorded to Harmel, in which Harmel fully opened his mind to the Holy Father, the Pope ended the interview with the emphatic words, "I approve of all you are doing in the past, of all you are doing to-day, and of all you are planning to do in the future."

The encyclical emphasizes the right of private property as a first principle. The Pope enumerates the moral forces which must determine the issues of economic measures, and their bearing on the solution of the problem. In the very front rank he places the danger of supposing that class is intended by nature to be hostile against class. Capital and labor have need of each other. Again, Utopian dreams of universal equality or unmitigated prosperity not only are misleading, but issue in bitterness and disappointment. "To suffer and endure is man's heritage." "All striving against nature is vain," he writes. And in several passages he warns the workman and his friends not to allow agitators to pervert a righteous movement into a means of fostering disaffection and disturbing order. The very absence of more decisive judgments on debated questions would seem significant of his view that the solution cannot be a matter of exact calculation, but must be determined by observation and experience. When it is debated whether some of Meyer's or De Mun's schemes would issue in a dangerous form of State Socialism, it is not enough to prove, in answer to such a fear, that they are theoretically reconcilable with the recognition of the rights of private property. The Pope himself supplies ampler criteria in the very passages which are complained of as vague. The question is, are you admitting a habit of State interference with individual liberty which atheistic Socialists may later on utilize for their own ends in tampering with rights which *you* yourself may hold to be fundamental to the existence of ordered society? Are you, again, introducing a scheme partitioned off from predatory Socialism by a partition which, however logically symmetrical, is not practically robust enough to stand against the popular tide? Is such an example as that of Abbé Daens in Belgium significant—in which democratic sympathies at one time carried a section of Catholics into open partisanship with the most extreme Socialists against a very moderately Conservative Government?

⁴ M. Grégoire notes the important fact that the Pope treats the duty of employers to grant a living wage as one of *justice* and not as a counsel of charity.

The net result of the Pontiff's exhortation appears to be clearly in favor of such work as can be done so entirely under religious influences that the danger—of which he seems extremely apprehensive—of setting in motion revolutionary passion would be reduced to a minimum. The immense prominence of the forces on either side which are outside theoretical economics is perhaps the chief lesson the encyclical inculcates. The Socialist leaders on the continent are all (according to Professor Nitti) atheists, and the denial of private property and subversion of the family are their avowed aims. The Pope treats submission to God, preservation of the family, the right to private property, as the first principles of a wise popular movement. It is difficult to see how the general principles of the encyclical could be translated into the concrete more thoroughly than they have been in M. Harmel's organization. But we come again to the question—does this supply any hope for success on a wide scale in a civilization which does not, as a whole, recognize the Church, and in which consequently such organizations are possible only in very limited areas? It is doubtless the enforced consideration of a wider *point of view* which urged such men as Vogelsang or Decurtins to bolder action. All their efforts have received acknowledgments from the Pope. Nevertheless the obvious outcome of the encyclical is that there is no adequate remedy to be found as long as society is governed by irreligious aims, does not face those facts of life of which religion ever reminds us, and makes war on the Church, which is the natural guardian of religious principles. Dreams of equality, dreams of millenary happiness, dreams that any happiness can be won by those who fail to cultivate the spirit of contentment and of endurance—such dreams are contradicted by the teaching both of experience and of the Gospel, and if they are persisted in the awakening must be bitter and disappointing. The Catholic bishops to whom the encyclical was addressed were exhorted on their side to do what they could to restore to men a belief in the ideals of the Gospel on these subjects. This encyclical on the great economic problem ends with words which will strike some readers as "vague sermonizing," and others as the very essence of any programme which is to succeed. One is the view of those who regard the crucial remedy of the evil as a matter for theoretical economic calculation; the other of those who look rather to the practical strengthening of that link in the chain of causes which consists of certain moral aims and a certain moral temper on the part of employers and employed alike, and the strenuous exclusion of their opposites.

"Every minister of holy religion [the Pope writes] must throw into the conflict all the energy of his mind and all the strength of his endurance; with your authority, venerable brethren, and by your

example, they must never cease to urge all men of every class, on the high as well as the lowly, the Gospel doctrines of the Christian life; by every means in their power they must strive for the good of the people; and above all they must earnestly cherish in themselves and try to arouse in others Charity, the mistress and queen of virtues. For the happy results for which we all long must be chiefly brought about by the plenteous outpouring of charity, of that true Christian charity which consists in the fulfilling of the whole Gospel law, which is always ready to sacrifice itself for others' sake, and which is man's surest antidote against unholy pride and an immoderate love of self, whose office is described, whose Godlike features are drawn, by the Apostle St. Paul in these words: 'Charity is patient, is kind . . . seeketh not her own . . . suffereth all things . . . endureth all things.'"

WILFRID WARD.

London.

THE HISTORICAL AND RELIGIOUS ORIGINS OF OUR RECENT IMMIGRANTS FROM EASTERN EUROPE.

AMONG the members of that very small minority of the inhabitants of the United States in whose veins a preponderancy of English blood is said—by themselves—to flow, there are some who still give credence to the historically inaccurate and ethnologically absurd assertion that the early glories and quickly-developed prosperity of the Republic are mainly due to "Anglo-Saxons." But even these innocents, many of whom are jejune of historical knowledge, and others of whom care not for an enlightenment which would dissipate their prejudices, cannot ignore the fact that during the last twenty or thirty years—to say nothing of the consequences of the Irish influx during many previous years—the presumed "Anglo-Saxons" have been relegated to an enforcedly modest position. In view of this eloquent truth, we may interest some of our readers if we devote a few pages to the origins of those peoples of eastern Europe who have recently contributed toward the formation of what will in the future become a practically homogeneous American Nation. As for the Irish, Germans, Italians, French, and Spaniards, whose blood has already transmogrified the "Anglo-Saxon" stock, their history speaks for itself.

Among all the eastern European peoples who have joined in the recent immigration, their numbers and importance demand that

first consideration be accorded to the Slavs, a Japhetic race who probably descend from Riphath, the third son of Gomer, and whose Asiatic origin is plainly evinced by their ancient language, and by their ancient religion and institutions. The ancient Slavs, known to the Greeks and Romans as Sarmatians, were repeatedly vanquished, but never permanently subjugated by the Quirites; and together with the Teutons, they were the means wherewith Divine Providence subverted the fourth of the empires seen in the vision of Daniel. The word "Slav" is encountered in no historical chronicle before the fourth century of the Christian era; the term is variously derived from *slava*, signifying "glory," and from *slovo*, which means a language; our own word "slave" reminds us of the miserably degraded condition into which the ancient Slavs had fallen. When the Slavs emigrated from Asia, they seized on the region extending from the Urals to the Vistula; and from the Black Sea, the Caucasus, and the Caspian, to the Baltic. One of their off-shoots, the Vends, finally extended their territories to the Illyrian and Carnic Alps; and a family of these Vends, termed Vindils, settled in the eastern portion of that region which is now known as Prussia—in fact, these Slavs were the progenitors of those Borussii or Prussians who were destined to be Germanized, some twelve centuries afterward, and at length to pose as leaders of the German peoples. Other tribes of Vends came to be known as Tchecks or Czecks, Slovacks, etc. From the first day of their meeting in Europe the Slavs and the Germanic tribes were in continual combat; and as fast as the Germans retired from the northern and eastern regions, the Slavs took their place. The ancient Slavs recognized a Supreme Being, but they also adored many inferior deities, both good and evil; and in time they adopted other divinities from the Greeks, Romans, and even from their hated foes, the Germans. In the olden days the Slavs were simple-minded; and Russian Slavophiles would have us believe that they were pastoral and gentle, and therefore fond of the arts of peace; but it is certain that they were malevolent and cruel until they were converted to Christianity. They invariably tortured their prisoners of war, and they respected their women so little that no man was ever punished for the murder of one; when a husband died, his wife was forced to kill herself, and this custom prevailed among the Poles until the tenth century, and very much longer among the Russians; it was an ordinary thing for mothers to slaughter their infants; human butchery alone could appease the *Tzerneboch* or Black God of the ancient Slavs. No Slavic people embraced Christianity before the seventh century. Then the Croats, newly arrived on the shores of the Adriatic, asked the Byzantine emperor, Constantine Pogonatus, for missionaries; and at the request of that prince, the Holy

See sent priests to them, and they were instructed and baptized, after they had sworn to abstain from every species of rapine. The conversion of the Russians did not even begin until the ninth century.

We know that the Slavs of our day consist of three branches: the Russians and Illyrians; the Poles, Bohemians, and Vends; and the Lithuanians. But we know nothing as to the identity of the first inhabitants of that land which became in time at least fundamentally Slavic, and which is now termed European Russia. The olden Roman writers gave the vague name of "Cymri" to those barbaric hordes who roamed in the regions immediately north of the Bosphorus; while they designated as "Scythians" and "Sarmatians" those barbarians who inhabited the more northern lands. These Scythians and Sarmatians were at one time termed "Rossolans," and some authors regard them as purely and simply Slavs; the founders of Novogorod were certainly Slavs, and such probably were the founders of Kiev, the second city of olden Russia. Nestor, the oldest of Russian chroniclers (d. 1116), contradicts the notion that the name "Russia" was derived from Ross, a son of Lech, the first prince of Poland; as also the theory in accordance with which the name came from the Rossolans or Roxans who once roamed along the banks of the Dnieper. The Russian monk holds that the designation was given by Scandinavian immigrants—a theory which favors the belief that Rurick the Norman applied the term in honor of his own native place, Rosland. We have already noted¹ that many Normans were found among the merchants from Novogorod who proceeded from Constantinople to the court of Louis le Débonnaire; and here we may add that the Lombard bishop and chronicler, Luitprand, in the report of the mission to Constantinople which he undertook for Otho of Germany in 968, speaks of "the Roussios, whom we also term Normans." If we may credit the assertions of Ibn-Foslan, whom the caliph of Bagdad sent as a missionary of Islam to those lands in the early part of the tenth century, the still Pagan Russian Slavs were then nearly as brutal as the Anglo-Saxons and the Huns had been before their conversion to the true faith; their physical and moral filth were phenomenal. Referring the reader to our account of the enterprise of Rurick the Norman, who was the prime founder of the Russian Empire,² we now note that after the death of Sviatoslav, son of Igor and Olga, in 973, his three sons, Oleg, Jaropok, and Vladimir, reigned simultaneously; the first over the Drevlians, the second at Kiev, and the third at Novogorod. War soon ensued between the brothers; and finally Vladimir, aided by an army of

¹ See our article on "The Commencements of the Normans" in the *QUARTERLY REVIEW*, Vol. XXVII.

² *Loc. cit.*

those Normans whom he and his fellows termed "Varangians," became sole monarch of the incipient Russian Empire. During his entire reign at Kiev (980-1014), Vladimir proved himself a valiant warrior; but until he became a Christian his morals, even according to the Pagan code, were abominable. In 988 he reduced the city of Kherson, then the capital of a sort of republic under the protection of the Lower Empire. It was from Kherson that Vladimir sent to Constantinople a request for the hand of the imperial princess, Anna; and according to Nestor, her arrival in Kherson was followed immediately by the baptism of Vladimir under the name of Vassili (Basil), and by the consequent cure of the prince from an almost entire blindness which a severe illness had brought upon him. This prodigy, together with the more than moral influence of Vladimir, induced his principal boyards and military officers to become Christians; and he evinced his gratitude to the Byzantine emperor by a renunciation of his right of conquest over Kherson, and by the loan of an army of Varangians, Franks, and Slavs, for the repression of the rebellion of Bardas Phocas. Having returned to Kiev, the grand-duke or grand-prince, as he was styled, effected the destruction of all the idols in his dominions; and to render the immolation more impressive, he ordered the statue of Perouna, a goddess whom he had specially venerated, to be beaten with rods, fastened to the tail of a horse, dragged to the Dnieper, and flung into the water. A church was erected on the spot where the statue of Perouna had stood, and another arose on the site of the martyrdom of Theodore, a Christian officer whom Vladimir had put to death because of his opposition to the sacrifice of his own son on the altar of the goddess. It is true that Vladimir, with the ill-balanced enthusiasm of a neophyte, undertook a forcible Christianization of his people; thus, on the morning after the disgrace of Perouna, he caused the baptism of all the inhabitants of Kiev. But he did not neglect the instruction of the "converts;" schools were established for their indoctrination into the Christian mysteries as illustrated by the Slavonic Liturgy which had been prepared by Sts. Cyril and Methodius—a Liturgy which was written, not in the continually changing vernacular of the Slavs, but in the language which is now termed the Old Slavonic, a mixture of the Thessalonic Greek with the Illyrian and Serb tongues. It was with great difficulty that Vladimir persuaded the Slavic parents, even those of elevated station, to send their children to these schools; these parents often wept as they consigned their little ones to institutions which were to initiate them, as was the popular belief, into an "art" which had been invented by sorcerers. By degrees, however, education followed in the wake of religion; and ere long the Slavic character exhibited a change like that which illustrated the

life of Vladimir—a change which afterward led the Russians to regard that monarch as not only “the Great,” but also as “the Saint.” He became the father of the poor; and his Christian gentleness, replacing his quondam Pagan ferocity, carried him to the extreme of punishing even murder with a simple fine, until the clergy showed him that an increase of crimes against the sanctity of human life demanded a restoration of capital punishment. Jeroslav, a son of Vladimir (1014-1054), was the first Russian sovereign to attempt a codification of the laws of his principality. Warned by the ambition of the patriarchs of Constantinople, no less than by the arrogance of the Byzantine emperors, he induced the Russian bishops, assembled at Kiev in 1051, to elect a metropolitan. The relations of Jaroslav with foreign nations were beneficial to his people. His sister, Mary, espoused Casimir, king of Poland; his eldest daughter, Elizabeth, was wedded to Harold, king of Norway; and his second daughter, Anna, married Henry I., king of France. Imitating Vladimir, who had instituted great schools in Kiev, he founded similar ones at Novogorod. He invited artists from Constantinople, and some of these minted the first Russian coins. Isiaslav, son of Jaroslav (1054-1078), was dethroned by his brother, Sviatoslav, in 1073. He appealed to Pope St. Gregory VII. for justice, although the Photian Schism, revived by the Constantinopolitan patriarch, Cerularius, was then trying to invade his dominions. He promised to recognize the Pontiff as his temporal lord, just as the Russian Church had hitherto recognized the Holy See as its spiritual head; and accordingly he besought the Pope to accept the suzerainty of the Russian monarchy. Probably this tender of vassallage had no practical sequel; although among the letters of Pope St. Gregory VII.^a we find one addressed “To the King of the Russians,” and couched in these significant terms: “Your son, having visited the Tomb of the Apostles, came to us, and earnestly besought us to grant him the grace of receiving your kingdom from our hands as a gift from St. Peter, after he would have promised to the said Peter, Prince of the Apostles, the obedience which is due to him. Your son also assured us that his request would be endorsed by you as soon as it would be heeded by our Apostolic authority. Therefore, since we regard his request as proper because of your consent, and because of the piety of the prince himself, we have finally granted it, entrusting him, in the name of St. Peter, with the government of your kingdom, and intending and hoping that St. Peter will intercede for you both at the Throne of God.” Having now given an epitome of the origins of the Russian Slavs who have emigrated to these United States of North America, we indicate our already cited articles in

^a Book II., Epistle 74.

this *Review* to the reader who is curious as to the origin of the Russian so-called "Orthodox" Church—an origin which is ascribed by English and German heterodox publicists to "the Greek Church," said appellation being of course understood as significant of an organization which is supposed to have been, at that time, hostile to the "pretensions" of the Roman See. In those articles we showed that the Russian Church is not Schismatic (or rather heretical) Greek in its origin; and that it is not Greek in its language, its polity, or its government. Very few members of the heretical "Orthodox" Church have taken residence in our republic; but their presence is indicated by the disturbances which frequently occur in congregations of the Greek Rite which are in full communion with the Roman Pontiff—disturbances which are generally incited by the emissaries of that Russian imperial-ecclesiastical coterie which is known as the "Holy Synod."⁴

Entering upon a brief sketch of the commencements of the Kingdom of Poland, we observe that the first indications of a Polish state are found in the eighth century; but long before that period, the regions known afterward as Courland, Greater and Lesser Poland, and Lithuania, had been inhabited by Slavic tribes who were termed Lettones or Lechs, and who, finally grouping themselves together, came to be designated as Polones or Slavs of the Plains—*polé*. Polish tradition narrates how Leszk or Lech, the first *voivod* or prince of the Poles, founded Gnesen and Posen; how the death of his successor entailed a division of the principality among the twelve minor *voivods*, the new states becoming so many palatinates; and how the tyranny of the petty princes induced the people to insist on a government by one monarch. This first sovereign was Craco, who assumed the title of *krol* about the year 600, founded the city of Cracow, and undertook a successful campaign against the Austrasian Franks. Craco was succeeded by his two sons, and then by his daughter, Vanda, the events of whose career, as they have been handed down to our time, seem to be legendary rather than

⁴ The curious reader who wishes to investigate the early history of the Russians, whether in its civil or in its ecclesiastical phases, may consult: Cantù, "Storia Universale," Bk. x., Turin, 1862; Nestor, "Annals," Edition Schlozer, Göttingen, 1802; Assemani, "Calendarie Ecclesiarum Universalium," Rome, 1755; Turgeniev, "Historica Russiarum Monumenta," St. Petersburg, 1841; Herbinus, "De Religiosis Kioviensibus Cryptis," cited by the Bollandists, "Acta Sanctorum," at Mch. 9; Beugnot, "Histoire de la Destruction du Paganisme en Occident," Paris, 1855; Brotonne, "Histoire de la Filiation et des Migrations des Peuples," Paris, 1857; Brzowski, "Dissertatio de Origine Christianæ Religionis in Russia," Rome, 1822; Verdière, "Origines Catholiques de l'Eglise Russe jusqu'au Douzième Siècle," Paris, 1857; Rambaud, "La Russie Epique," Paris, 1876; Duchesne, "Les Eglises Séparées," Paris, 1897; Hergenrother, "Monumenta Græca ad Photium, Ejusque Historiam Pertinentia," Ratisbon, 1869; Ralston, "Early Russian History," London, 1874; Anton, "Versuch über die alten Slaven," Leipzig, 1785; Dobrowski, "Untersuchung woher die Slaven ihren Namen erhalten haben," Prague, 1784; Karamsine, "Geschichte von Rußland," Riga, 1820; Kaisarov, "Slavinski Mithologia," Moscow, 1807; Shaffarik, "Slavianskia Drevnosti," Moscow, 1857.

historical. She is described as a haughty Amazon who defended herself and her kingdom against the Germanic tribes not only with her sword, but with the power of her beauty and eloquence. Proud of her virginity, Vanda spurned all offers of marriage; therefore her demise enabled the *voivods* to repartition the kingdom. However, about the year 750, an obscure soldier, named Przemysl (Premislaus), united the nation under his strong rule; and it was not again divided until the perpetration of the monumental infamy of 1772. Few historians have cared to note that the Holy See, ever ready to perpetuate a nation's title to the gratitude of Christendom, conferred on the Polish kingdom, almost at its birth as a Christian state, the designation of "Most Orthodox," just as it had rewarded the zeal of the first French monarch with the style of "Most Christian." It was only during the reign of Boleslas the Great (992-1025) that complete success crowned the efforts for the Christianization of the Poles—a task which, together with the significance of the United Greek Rite among the Poles, we have already described in the previously cited articles. The reign of Boleslas the Great was devoted less to conquest, than to an amelioration of the condition of his people. He had found the Poles divided into several classes: the *servi* or slaves; the *liberati* or serfs; the *rustici* or agriculturists, who were really a kind of lesser nobles; and finally the veritable nobility. A wise demarcation of the rights of these classes was the chief object of the reign of Boleslas; an assimilation of them all into one mass of citizens of equal standing, and at one stroke of the pen, would have been impossible. He partitioned the kingdom into *civitates* or districts; he endeavored to draw the populations into the *burgi* or cities; and outside every city, he procured the construction of one or more castles, in which resided nobles who were entrusted with the maintenance of order, the administration of justice, the collection of taxes, and the control of military service. He visited personally every one of these castles at least once in three years, being always accompanied by his council of six ecclesiastical and six lay peers, who assisted him in the adjudication of cases of appeal from the decisions rendered by the authorities of the first instance.

Miecyslas II., son and successor of Boleslas the Great, was an illustration of the historical truth that a great ruler is seldom succeeded by another of similar calibre. Miecyslas was weak and indolent; and he allowed his wife, a German, not only to rule in his name, but even to attempt the Germanization of Poland. German invaders seized the western provinces while Miecyslas followed his policy of *laissez faire*; and then the castellans, true to the Polish proverb which says that a Pole will never be a brother to a German so long as the sun shines, threw off their allegiance, and declared their independ-

ence. On the death of Miecyslas, in 1034, his German widow, Rixa, was forced to flee with her son, Casimir, and Poland fell into anarchy. Fortunately for the country, Rixa had sent her boy, 18 years old at the time of the revolution, to France for his education; and for that purpose he had selected the celebrated Benedictine monastery of Cluny, joining the order, and receiving the diaconate in due time. In 1041 a deputation from Poland summoned him to the government of a people who were tired of dissension. Pope Benedict IX. released him from his monastic vows, and also from his clerical obligation of celibacy; he donned the Polish crown, and married Anna, sister of Vladimir, grand-duke of Russia. Casimir brought many of the monks of Cluny into Poland; and soon the land beheld the miracles of agriculture, bridge-building, etc., which had caused the sons of St. Benedict to be blessed throughout Western Europe as exponents of the Catholic spirit in its apposite task of civilizing barbarians. With the aid of his quondam companions of the cowl, Casimir banished the surviving remnants of Paganism from his kingdom. He reconquered all that his predecessor had lost to the Russians and Germans; and he compelled the Prussians, still a Slavic and a Pagan people, to swear vassallage to the Polish crown. When he died, in 1058, his people well said that Casimir had restored Poland. Boleslas II., called "the Rash" (1058-1081), was a brave prince, and generally a wise ruler; but he was a tyrant, and his morals were of the worst. The catastrophe of his life arrived when he murdered, with his own hand and at the altar of God, the holy Bishop of Cracow, Stanislaus, because the prelate had denounced the royal excesses. Excommunicated and therefore dethroned by Pope St. Gregory VII., and abandoned by all, he fled to a retired spot in Hungary, and in order to do penance for his sacrilegious crime, entered a monastery as a lay brother, keeping his identity a secret; he was put to work in the kitchen, and not until he was about to emit his last breath did the monks learn that their humble scullion had once sat on the throne of Poland. The royal murderer had certainly shown sorrow for his crime; but Pope St. Gregory VII. declared that the foul sacrilege could not be sufficiently punished on earth by the dethronement, or by any penance, of the guilty king. He deprived Poland of the dignity of a kingdom, and reduced it to the rank of a duchy. Two hundred and forty years passed ere a Polish duke, Ladislas Logotek, dared to ask the Holy See to lift the heavy censure; in 1319 this prince begged Pope John XXII. to allow him and his legitimate successors to be styled: "King of Poland by the grace of God, and by the favor of the Apostolic See," and the request was granted. Vladislas I. (1081-1102), brother of the wretched Boleslas II., saw the beginning of the Crusades, but he

took no part in the enterprise; he fought successfully against the Bohemians, and also against the still Pagan Prussians, those Slavs who bore with ill grace the yoke of vassalage which Casimir had imposed upon them. Such were the commencements of that noble Polish nation, of which so many thousand members have recently fled from Russian "Orthodox" and Prussian Protestant persecution in order to blend their glorious stock with those many others which are forming a people which promises to become, ere long, a Catholic nation. When that consummation shall have been reached, it will probably be seen that, after the Irish immigration, no other will have contributed to it so powerfully as the Polish—an immigration of Catholics whose religious glories are excelled only by those of whom we read in the *Gesta Dei per Francos*.⁵

Very few years have elapsed since the first Hunnish invasion of the great North American Republic. Like all the other immigrants to the Western World—Spaniards, Frenchmen, "Anglo-Saxons," Irishmen, Germans, Italians, and Asiatics of every description—who have made for themselves, during the last five centuries, new homes in the modern "Promised Land," these Hungarians came and will come in order to better their condition. Just as were nearly all the other immigrants who helped to relegate the real Americans of the north to another "Promised Land," the Hungarians now among us are endowed with little else than brawn and muscle, and a determination to prosper in the race of life. The ignorant, as well as the self-complacent who try to forget the struggles for existence which their almost immediate forbears endured, describe these later immigrants as "Hunks," in a spirit very like that which Latin Americans manifest when they designate as "Gringos" those Yankee prospectors and insolent tourists who seem to presage an undesirable evolution among them. But the history of Hungary shows that her sons possess qualities which will add to the strength of the coming American Nation. During the latter half of the eighth century, the Franks and the Bulgarians destroyed that empire of the Avari in Pannonia and Dacia which had succeeded to that of the Huns of Attila. About the year 884 there appeared in those regions a new conglomeration of hordes, concerning whose origin nothing in the way of certainty can be predicated, but who, according to the more probable opinion, had dwelt, before the fifth century, in the Himalayan regions

⁵ For details of the commencements of Poland, consult: Cantù, *loc. cit.*: Assemani, *loc. cit.*; Lequien, "Oriens Christianus," Paris, 1713-34; Lescœur, "L'Eglise en Pologne," Paris, 1876; Koklius, "Introductio ad Historiam Slavorum," Altona, 1729; Salvandy, "Histoire de Pologne avant et sous Jean Sobiesky," Paris, 1827; Chwalekowski, "Jus Publicum Regni Poloniæ," Paris, 1706; Kulczynski, "Relationes Authenticæ de Statu Ruthenorum cum Sancta Romana Ecclesia Unitorum," Rome, 1727; Harasiewicz, "Annales Ecclesiæ Ruthenicæ Gratiam et Communionem cum Sancta Sede Romana Habentis, Ritusque Græco-Slavicum Observantis," Leopolia, 1862.

at the north of China. They styled themselves "Madyares," an appellation which the westerns soon turned into "Magyars," and which was probably derived from the name of one of their chiefs. There seems to be no reason for doubting the identity of this race with that of the olden Huns who were frequently termed "Oogours," "Hunigours," and "Hunigares." The word "Hungarian" is evidently derived from these appellations; and we know that the term "ogre," which entered into all European languages in the ninth and tenth centuries, as significant of a bloodthirsty monster, was meant to indicate the uncouthness and cruelty of the Hunnish barbarians who had not yet been brought by the Church to the civilization with which she had already endowed the other European barbarians—the Franks, the Anglo-Saxons, the Germans, most of the Scandinavians, and all of the Slavs except the Prussians whose conversion was not to occur before the thirteenth century. The religious tenets of these Hungarians would indicate that after their abandonment of the Himalayan regions, probably in the early years of the fourth century, they had roamed for many years in that part of Central Asia which borders on Persia; although it is true that some of them had settled at once in the land of the Bashkirs in Eastern Russia, where they were subjugated by the Turks in the sixth century. The greater part of the nation, however, halted in the regions situated between the Caspian and the Volga; and there, as the Byzantine historians tell us, they were found by the ambassadors whom Justin II. sent to the Turks in 569. During the two following centuries they moved gradually westward; and Nestor speaks of one of their hordes as passing near Kiev in 898, while it is certain that some of them had already penetrated into Moravia in answer to an invitation extended by the Slavs of that land who desired their aid against the Germans. Compelled by a Turkish advance to fall back on the Carpathians, the Hungarians were soon driven from their new territories by the Bulgarians; but in 884, their chief, Almus, replied to the invitation of the Byzantine emperor, Leo the Philosopher, by leading his followers through Pannonia until he reached the left bank of the Danube. In 892 Arpad fixed them so firmly in Pannonia that it became their future residence, or rather headquarters; for a century was to elapse ere the accession of St. Stephen would put an end to the devastations with which they filled Germany and France, and at times even Italy. In 900, while Arpad was consolidating his duchy of Hungary, several of his enterprising sub-chiefs ravaged Carinthia, and having crossed the Friulan Alps, devastated Lombardy as far as Pavia. Berengarius, who had triumphed over his adversaries, and was then undisputed king of Italy, advanced against the barbarians, defeated them, and pursued them as far as

the Brenta, where they offered to restore all their captives and plunder, if the Italian monarch would allow them to recross the Alps. The proposition was rejected by Berengarius, who had deemed the opportunity favorable for an extermination of such redoubtable enemies of Christendom; but desperation so animated the Hungarians that in the ensuing battle they were victorious, and they did not evacuate the peninsula until their booty had satisfied even their phenomenal greed. In 905 they made another raid, killed 20,000 of the warriors whom Berengarius opposed to them, and sacked Pavia and Brescia; in fact, they did not pause in their work of rapine until Berengarius paid them an immense sum of money, and furthermore promised to pay them well if they would help him to repel Rudolph of Trans-Juran Burgundy, who was then trying to deprive him of the crown of the Holy Roman Empire which he had received from Pope John X. in the year 915. The wicked compact having been made, the Magyars began their campaign by sacking Milan and Pavia; in the latter city they murdered its bishop and also the bishop of Vercelli, and they leveled forty-three churches to the ground. Having ravaged the north of Italy until they were defeated by the Venetians at Malamocco and Rialto, they turned their arms against the south. Capua, Salerno, Benevento, Nola, Montecassino, and Taranto were pillaged; and so terrible were the traces of their passage through the land, that the Italian chroniclers of the time inform us that the populations wondered whether or not their enemies were followers of Gog and Magog, the precursors of the Last Judgment. The flat and brutal countenances of the Hungarians must have been horrors indeed, since scars of battle were not the sole distinguishing mark of a male Hungarian of those days; every Hungarian mother was wont to bite the face of the male babe at her breast in order to accustom him to pain, and since these bites continued during his early boyhood, or until the production of the desired effect, the features of the grown man must have presented a hideously seamy appearance.

France also suffered from Hungarian irruptions. In 917, while Charles the Simple was engaged with his domestic enemies, Lorraine was ravaged; another invasion, which extended to the Aisne and to the Atlantic, occurred in 926; and as late as 933 a third though minor raid was effected. An attempt of the Magyars to pass into Spain, in order to possess themselves of the treasures amassed by the caliphs of Cordova, was successfully resisted by Raymond Pons, Count of Toulouse, whose Christian animosity to the Saracens did not blind him to the danger of increasing the arrogance of the Pagans; and after their defeat by this French knight, a plague so weakened the surviving Magyars in France, that the Land of the Lilies was soon freed from their presence.

It was Germany, however, that suffered most from the race of Attila; although far less rich a land than either Italy or France, and therefore less attractive to the freebooter, Germany was especially hated by the Magyars as being the nearest Christian neighbor to the region which they had marked for their own. Zoltan, son of Arpad, forced Conrad of Franconia to pay him tribute, after he had defeated and killed Leopold of Bavaria, the commander of the army of the last Carolingian king of the Germans (907). In 919 Zoltan defeated and killed Conrad; and then the Magyars had full play in Franconia, Bavaria, and Saxony. Henry the Fowler also became tributary to Zoltan in 924; but in 933 Henry engaged the Hungarians in the battle of Merseburg, in which 40,000 of them are said to have fallen, and thus he taught Zoltan to be more wary. In 955 Zoltan again invaded Germany while Italian matters were occupying the attention of Otho I., the first Holy Roman Emperor of the German line. Augsburg was besieged; but its bishop, Ulderic, with his priestly stole crossed on his breast, headed the citizens in a brave defense until the arrival of the emperor with a powerful army. We note that Otho wielded the sword of Charlemagne, and a lance pointed with one of the nails used at the crucifixion of Our Lord, in the furious battle which ensued; but we also read that he put all his prisoners to death, hanging three of the principal Hungarian chiefs on the walls of Ratisbon. This defeat prevented the Hungarians from troubling Western Europe during the next thirty years; they turned their attention to the Lower Empire, ravaging Thrace and Macedonia, and pushing their way even to the walls of Constantinople, where their army was almost annihilated. In vain they now entered into alliance with the Russians; a crushing defeat at Adrianople forced the survivors to return to Pannonia. The time was now approaching, however, when the Church was to style Hungary "the Kingdom of Mary." About the year 970, St. Wolfgang, a Benedictine monk who afterward became bishop of Ratisbon, led several of his monastic companions to a projected conquest of Hungary for the Church of Christ; and when failure had ensued, the Apostolic work was resumed in 973 by Bruno, bishop of Werden, and by Piligrin, bishop of Passau. Five hundred converts had been made, when war again ensued between the Hungarians and the Germans. Most of the neophytes returned to Paganism; but with the advent of peace in 985, St. Adalbert, who was destined to be martyred by the Prussians, induced Geyza, the Hungarian chief or duke, to receive Baptism. However, this princely conversion was, at least for a time, of problematical sincerity; for some years Geyza practiced simultaneously both Christianity and Paganism, replying to an episcopal rebuke that he was "sufficiently rich to worship all the gods that existed." Waic,

a son of Geyza, who received the name of Stephen at the baptismal font, evinced his sincerity as a Christian in every act of his career; and he became the veritable apostle of Christianity among his people. When his zeal, especially in the matter of an emancipation of all the slaves in Hungary, caused a revolt of his subaltern chieftains, he proclaimed a war against the recalcitrants in the name of Christ. Having vanquished his domestic foes, and having arranged a solid peace with all his neighbors, he devoted the remainder of his reign to the extirpation of idolatry; and in this work he was aided not only by the monks of St. Benedict, but by the fact of his marriage with Gisela, a sister of St. Henry II., one of the few Holy Roman Emperors of the German line who filled properly their position in the Christian body-corporate. The zeal of Stephen extended beyond his own dominions. In Jerusalem he founded and endowed a monastery; in Constantinople he erected a magnificent church; and in the Eternal City he established a college for the Hungarians, that is, an institution where worthy ecclesiastics of his nation might imbibe the true spirit of Papal Rome, and where Hungarian pilgrims might be entertained gratuitously. Long before the death of Stephen, ten bishoprics, under the jurisdiction of the metropolitan of Gran, were instituted and munificently endowed; and there was at least one church for every ten villages. When the work of Christianization had been fairly consolidated, Stephen sent to Rome, in the year 1000, precisely at the time when the Christian world is said by historians of the Gibbonian stamp to have been prostrated in panic because of a fear of the imminent end of all mundane things, a Hungarian bishop who was to present the following requests to the Pontiff. His Holiness was asked to consider the religious and political conditions of the nation which had recently been added to his fold; he was entreated to confirm the institutions established by Stephen; and as Vicar of Christ, the head of the *Populus Christianus*, he was urged to raise the duchy of Hungary, now dedicated in a special manner to the honor and service of the Mother of God, to the rank of a kingdom. Pope Sylvester II. accorded these requests, not only elevating Hungary to the rank of a kingdom, but conferring on Stephen and his legitimate successors the title of "Apostolic King," together with the absolutely unique privilege of having the Cross carried before them on all solemn occasions—prerogatives which have ever been jealously guarded by all Hungarian kings, even by such of the Hapsburg wearers of the crown of St. Stephen as showed themselves utterly unworthy of the succession. The chief conquest of Stephen was the region which we know as Transylvania, so termed because the Hungarians styled it *Erdely-Orszag* or *Trans Sylvas*, its situation being beyond the vast forests

of the Carpathians. When death came to Stephen in 1038, the evidences of his heroic sanctity induced Pope Benedict IX. to enroll him among the canonized saints. Emeric, son and heir of this holy monarch, and like him a saint, had died before his father's demise; and consequently Hungary suffered from anarchy until the accession of Geyza (1074-1077). The rulers who held successively a precarious grasp of the sceptre until the advent of Geyza, namely, Samuel, Andrew, Bela I., and Salomon, were unable to prevent the dismemberment of their kingdom by the kings of the Germans; a portion of Pannonia went to swell the then growing importance of the margraves of Austria. Geyza restored some amount of order in his dominions; and his brother, St. Vladislav (1077-1095), resumed the work of St. Stephen by the promulgation of many wise laws which he knew how to enforce. In 1089 he joined Croatia to Hungary, and soon afterward he rendered Bulgaria and Servia tributaries of his crown. He was preparing to join the French in the First Crusade, when death compelled him to leave a reconsolidated kingdom to his son, Coloman. Vladislav was canonized by Pope Celestine III.⁶

The Bohemians are by no means an unimportant element among those eastern Europeans who have contributed their quota to the formation of the now developing new American stock, and their share in the progress of Catholicism in our country has been greater than their numbers would indicate. But their historical and religious origin is generally so well known that merely a few words concerning it are here demanded.

The name of Bohemia is derived from that of the Boii, a tribe of Celts who settled in that region about 580 B. C. During the reign of Augustus these Boii were supplanted by the Marcomanni, who continued in possession of the country until the beginning of the seventh century of our era, when they were subjugated by the Czechs, a Slavic people who had chosen for their king a Frankish merchant named Samon, who had led them to victory against the Avari. Under this Frankish king (610-658), the Bohemian nation was consolidated; but after his demise, the monarchy gave place to several Czech republics, the principal one of which was that of Prague. In a few years, however, the monarchy was restored by Croc, probably one of the thirty-seven heirs whom the twelve Czech wives of Samon had given to that sovereign. A daughter of Croc, Libussa, suc-

⁶ Consult: Canto, *ubi supra*, Book X.; Ohantrel, "Cours d'Histoire Universelle," Period II., Paris, 1885; Dussieux, "Essai Historique sur les Invasions des Hongrois," Paris, 1850; Bartholomæus, "Memorabilia Provinciarum," Czetnick, 1799; Pray, "Annales Hungarorum," Pesth, 1800; Patterson, "The Magyars, Their Country and Institutions," London, 1869.

ceeded to the throne in 720; and by her marriage with a peasant named Przemyśl (Premislas) there was originated a dynasty which continued in power until its extinction in the fourteenth century.

Little is known concerning the successors of Przemyśl until the accession of Borziwog (876-897), who was converted to Christianity by St. Methodius, but most of whose subjects refused to abandon Paganism. About the year 920, the few Christians in Bohemia were persecuted bitterly by Drahomira, the widow of Duke Vratislas; but when this princess warred on Henry the Fowler, she lost her throne, that German monarch putting her son, Wencislaus, in her place in 927, on condition that Bohemia should pay an annual tribute to the king of the Germans. Wenceslaus favored the propagation of Christianity among his people; and therefore his Pagan mother induced her second son, Boleslas, to murder him in 938. The first years of the fratricide's reign were signalized by virulent persecutions of the Christians; but when Emperor Otho I. appeared before Prague at the head of an army in order to enforce the payment of the tribute which Boleslas had refused, the Bohemian promised not only to fulfill his obligation, but also to tolerate missionary efforts among his subjects. Boleslas seems to have performed condign penance for his crime; at any rate, his latter years were those of a Christian. However, the conversion of Bohemia progressed but little until the reign of his son, Boleslas II., called the "Pious" (967-999). Bohemia was raised to the rank of a kingdom by Emperor Henry IV. in 1092 in favor of Duke Vratislas II.; but until 1230, when Wenceslaus III. mounted the throne, the royalty was elective.⁷

As yet comparatively few Moravians, Bulgarians, Moldavians, and Wallachians, have mingled their blood with that of the Anglo-Hibernico-Latino-Teutonic stock which started our Republic upon its career. But so many Moravians have already settled among us, and so strong are the indications that numbers of the other just mentioned peoples will soon do likewise, that the reader may not be displeased if we devote some space to their origin. Beginning with the Moravians and the Bulgarians, we note that in the fifth century of our era, the Vends, then one of the principal branches of the Slavic family, occupied the regions which had been abandoned by the Marcomani, Boii, Lombards, Vandals, Angles, and Saxons. Therefore the chief Vendic tribes, namely, the Moravians, Bohemians, and Obotriti, were neighbors of the Bavarians, Thuringians, etc.; and the conquest of these latter barbarians by the Franks brought the former into relationship with the Clodovigians. The

⁷ Consult: Canth, *ubi supra*; Freher, "*Scriptores Rerum Bohemicarum*," Heidelberg, 1699.

Obotriti of Dacia swore fealty to the Franks, and obtained lands in Pannonia; those of Nordalbingia (the region north of the Elbe) gradually appropriated the olden territories of the Saxons and Danes as these peoples moved to the conquest of Britain, and Mecklenburg ("the great city") became the residence of their prince or duke. The empire of the Moravians, so-called because they inhabited the lands in the neighborhood of the Morave, was soon overthrown by the Avari; afterward they became subject to the Bohemians; but about the year 805 they recovered their autonomy under the leadership of their "ban," Tudan, who paid homage to Charlemagne.

In 846, Ratislas, whom Louis "the Germanic" had placed on the Moravian throne, discontinued the tribute which was incumbent upon his vassalage; and since the refusal was equivalent to a declaration of war, Louis marched against him. Defeated, the emperor was barely able to evacuate Moravia; then Ratislas crossed the Danube and devastated Pannonia, easily defeating or outwitting the imperial generals. In 864 Louis returned with an immensely superior force, and compelled Ratislas to renew his engagement of fidelity; but in 872, when all the Slavs along the imperial frontiers arose in arms, the Moravians waged the most bitter war.

In 884 Charles the Fat congratulated himself on having obtained from Svientopolk a promise that the Holy Roman Empire would be spared during his lifetime; and when Emperor Arnoul found his states menaced by the Hungarians, he purchased a continuance of the Moravian toleration by a recognition of Svientopolk's annexation of Bohemia. This latter imperial concept was punished by the Bohemians; they renounced all obligations to an emperor who had betrayed them, and in 894 they turned the tables on Moravia by an annexation of it to their own domination. In an endeavor to vindicate his imperial claims, Arnoul ravaged Moravia; and the war continued until the guardians of Louis the Younger recognized the independence of Moravia, on the sole condition that it would pay tribute to the Holy Roman Emperor.

In 908 the Hungarians and the Bohemians partitioned the sorely-tried Moravian kingdom, leaving to its sovereign merely a small portion of its ancient territory which was thereafter known as the Margravate of Moravia, and was merely a dependency of Bohemia.

Before we speak of the conversion of the Moravians to Christianity, a few words must be devoted to the commencements of the Bulgarians, originally an Asiatic people whose early European history is deeply involved in that of the Lower Empire. Misled by the many Slavic words which crept into the language of the Kutri-guri during their long sojourn in the regions of the Volga (whence their later appellation as "Vulgari" or "Bulgari"), many historians have re-

garded them as Slavs—a blunder which is naturally pleasing to the Russian Colossus. But it is very probable that the Bulgari were of the same Mongolian stock as the Huns, Finns, and Lapps.

After the fall of Attila the Bulgarians endeavored to restore the Hunnish empire, and they were repelled by Theodoric the Ostrogoth; but when that monarch undertook his Italian expedition, leaving his home territories unprotected, the Bulgarians occupied the more desirable regions. Thrace soon became their prey; and from that time until the fall of the Lower Empire, they were, according to their necessities or their whims, either defenders of that power, or a thorn in its side. In 968, Svietoslav, grand-prince or grand-duke of Russia, complying with the request of the Byzantine emperor, Nicephorus Phocas, took possession of Bulgaria; but four years afterward, John Zimesces, successor of Nicephorus, expelled the Russians, and in 1018 Basil II. effected, as he thought, a definitive annexation of the principality to the Lower Empire.

In 1185 Emperor Isaac Angelus endeavored to deprive the Bulgarians of their flocks, whereupon a terrible war ensued, the insurgents being led by two brothers, Peter and Asan, and after their death on the field, by another brother named John. It was to this John that Pope Innocent III. accorded the title of King of Bulgaria.

The conversion of the Bulgarians to Christianity was begun and almost completed in the year 865 by two Thessalonican Greeks, Sts. Cyril and Methodius. St. Cyril appears in history for the first time in 847, when, according to Anastasius the Librarian, he reproved Photius, afterward the prime author of the separation of the Constantinopolitan patriarchate from the unity of the Catholic Church, for teaching that there are two souls in man. Cyril insisted, says Anastasius, that it was the animosity of the future heretic against the legitimate patriarch, Ignatius, that was to drag the wretched man into apostasy. Shortly after this episode in the life of St. Cyril, and several years before Photius supplanted Ignatius and actuated his fell design, the Khazar Turks, then dwelling in the region between Bulgaria and Moravia, requested the empress-regent, Theodora, to send some missionaries to them. After consultation with Ignatius, the empress intrusted the task of converting the Khazars to St. Cyril. In a short time the *chagan* or khan and his principal officers were baptized, and ere long the entire nation followed their example. While St. Cyril was evangelizing the Khazars, a sister of Bogoris, prince of the Bulgarians, became a Christian in Constantinople, where she had been a prisoner of war for some years. Returning to her people, she tried to propagate the faith among them, beginning with her brother. Bogoris resisted her endeavors; but he expressed a desire that a Greek painter would come to him for the purpose of

decorating one of his residences. Theodora sent St. Methodius, a brother of St. Cyril, who, like many other monks of that day, was an excellent artist; and when Bogoris commissioned him to depict some event which would terrify the beholders, the holy man executed a tableau of the Last Judgment. The representation so impressed the prince, that he began to study the mysteries of the Christian religion; his baptism followed, probably in 865. One of the first steps of Prince Michael, as he was thenceforth styled, was to send an embassy to Pope Nicholas I., asking for more missionaries, and for some bishops for his people; he also asked the Pontiff for guidance in the matter of certain religious doubts which were agitating his Christian subjects. In reply, His Holiness urged the prince to use no violence toward such of the Bulgarians as persisted in idolatry. "Be content with exhortations," said the Pope; "try to convince the idolaters that their practices are futile; have no other relations with them, and thus you may fill them with a salutary confusion." The Pontiff blamed Bogoris for having amputated the nose and ears of a Greek layman who had represented himself as a priest, and had baptized many of the Pagans: "The man was indeed wicked when he posed as a priest, but you should have been content with his expulsion from your dominions; as for the baptisms which he administered, know that those baptisms are valid, if he conferred them in the name of the Holy Trinity, since the validity of a Sacrament does not depend on the virtue of its minister." Then after some instruction as to the observance of the Lord's Day and the Feasts of the Church, the Pope continues: "You ask me whether a patriarch for your people can be appointed. Know that the veritably patriarchal churches are those which received that preëminence from the Apostles; namely, Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria. It is true that the churches of Jerusalem and Constantinople now bear this title; but they do not possess any patriarchal authority. Certainly the church of Constantinople was not founded by any one of the Apostles; but since that capital was once styled 'the New Rome,' its bishop came to be termed a patriarch, but only by imperial favor, not in accordance with ecclesiastical law. We intend to appoint a bishop for your people; and when the number of Christians in Bulgaria warrants his promotion, we shall confer the dignity of an archbishop on that prelate." Immediately after the inditing of this letter, Pope Nicholas commissioned the bishops of Porto and Piombino for the completion of the work of St. Methodius; and in a few years Paganism was merely a memory among the Bulgarians.

In 867 Sts. Cyril and Methodius united in the task of converting the Moravians, having been invited by King Ratislas. It was for the better prosecution of this mission that St. Cyril invented that

Slavonic alphabet which is still used in Bulgaria, Servia, Bosnia, Moldavia, and Wallachia; and for the same purpose he translated the Scriptures and many works of the Fathers into Slavonic. It must not be forgotten, however, that four centuries previously St. Jerome had invented, or at least adapted, a "glagolitic" alphabet for the Moravians; and that the invention by St. Cyril was merely an improvement on the Hieronymite enterprise, being the Greek alphabet with an addition of ten characters indicative of sounds peculiar to the Slavic idiom. During the first days of the Pontificate of Adrian II., Sts. Cyril and Methodius proceeded to Rome in order to render an account of their mission. St. Cyril died soon afterward; and the Pontiff appointed St. Methodius as bishop of Moravia and of Pannonia. Some of the German bishops bore with bad grace this curtailment of their presumed jurisdiction; and in their name the bishop of Passau forwarded to the Holy See a complaint to the effect that St. Methodius had erred in matters of faith, and that he had violated ecclesiastical discipline by the use of Slavonic instead of Latin in the liturgy. Pope John VIII. ordered the saint to justify himself in Rome; in the meantime he was to use either Latin or Greek in the liturgy, although, of course, he and his priests should continue to preach in the Slavonic language. St. Methodius understood the virtue of obedience to legitimate authority; he proceeded to the Eternal City, and the result of his submission is given in the letter which the Pontiff sent to Sviatopolk, the successor of Ratislas: "We have questioned our venerable brother, Archbishop Methodius, as to whether he has held and chanted the Creed as it is presented by the Holy Roman Church, and he has proved that he does so in accordance with the traditions of this Holy See. We approve the Slavonic alphabet which was invented by the philosopher, Constantine (so St. Cyril had been termed before he became a priest), and we command that the actions and praises of Jesus Christ be proclaimed in the Slavonic language. But in order to manifest a special respect to the Gospel, we decree that in the celebration of the Holy Mass it be read first in Latin, and then immediately in Slavonic for the benefit of those who do not understand the Latin language." Shortly after St. Methodius returned to Moravia, he took the first step toward the conversion of the Bohemians, who were then vassals of the Moravian monarch. Borzivog, their prince, paid a visit to Sviatopolk, and was received with due honor; but when the royal party took their seats for dinner, the Bohemian, being a Pagan, was told to sit on the ground. The Christian prelate endeavored by extraordinary politeness to render the position of Borzivog less humiliating, and consequently their conversation became confidential. Little by little the truths of Christianity were explained to the

prince, and after the meal he asked for Baptism. Thirty of the Bohemian counts joined in the request of their lord, and after due instruction, the entire party became Christians. Priests went with them when they returned to their people, and the conversion of the nation was soon under way. Ludmilla, the wife of Borzivog, who had been a zealous idolatress, became a saint and a martyr, and she was the grandmother of St. Wenceslaus.⁸

To the average student in this country, the name of Roumania may possibly be known as that of an independent principality dating from the year 1859; but he scarcely knows the names of those ancient nationalities—Moldavia and Wallachia (Zara Romanesca)—which have formed the modern kingdom. Moldavia and Wallachia were the path by which, during many centuries, Europe was entered by the barbarians from the regions of the Caucasus and the Caspian. The first inhabitants of these regions, at least the first mentioned in history, were the Agatirsi, whom Herodotus describes as having, in his day, become an effeminate race, and who afterward became the prey of the Scythians of the Euxine territories, and of the Geti—the latter originally a Thracian stock which had settled in the region bounded by the Danube, the Ems, and the Euxine. Amid the discordant opinions of the investigators into the limits and vicissitudes of the barbaric tribes who pounced upon Europe during the early centuries of our era, if we take as our guide Carlo Troya, an Italian historian who is the most profound of all these indagators, the Geti were the ancestors of those Goths whose name was so terrible in the Italy, southern France, and Spain of the fifth century. One of the most famous offshoots of the Getic stock was formed by the Dacians, who were also styled Davi or Dai, as we learn from the ancient Greek and Roman playwrights who were wont to describe promiscuously the clownish and rascally servants of their comedies as Geti, Dacians, Davi and Dai. We learn from Strabo that long after the Dacians had established themselves between the Danube and the Pruth, they continued to speak the language of the other Geti, namely, the Thracian; they preserved the Getic customs and also the Getic religion—that is, the cult of Zamolxes, having for their chief dogma the immortality of the soul which was destined to perpetual joy in company with Zamolxes if its possessor proved himself valorous in this life. According to Dion Chrysostom, a contemporary of Trajan, the Dacians were the most cultured of the barbarians of his day, and we may credit the assertion, since in the time of Julius Cæsar they had a code of laws which had been prepared by Deceneus, a Dacian who had studied in Egypt. This code was destined to be the basis for the laws of the Visigoths of Spain, and

⁸ Consult: Cantù and Chantrel, *ubi supra*; the Bollandists, "Acta Sanctorum," at Mch. 9.

for the laws of the Ostrogoths of Italy. When Scribonius Curio, proconsul of Macedonia, carried the Roman eagles for the first time to the Thracian banks of the Danube in 73 B. C., the dominions of the Dacian king, Berekistus, reached from Bessarabia (the "Desert of the Geti") to the lands of the Boii in Hungary, and to the eastern limits of Bohemia. Scribonius dared not to penetrate the dense forests of Dacia; but his successor, Marcus Lucullus, not only repelled the Dacians from the frontier of Macedonia, but destroyed their city of Appolonia at the mouths of the Danube. After the death of Berekistus, the Dacian kingdom was partitioned among many petty sovereigns, and the Romans found it an easy task to repel their incursions, as well as those of their allies, the Sarmatians. But during the reign of Domitian, Decebalus reunited the Dacian sovereignties, established his capital in the natural fortress of Sarmisagetusa in the Southern Carpathians, and so far restored the glories of Berekistus as to extend his dominion throughout the Carpathian and Danubian regions, from the Theiss to the Dniester. To make matters worse for the Romans, Decebalus had studied their military art, and he became a master in strategy, fortification, entrenchment, etc. Oppius Sabinus and Cornelius Fuscus were defeated successively, and the exultant Dacians hailed their king and his soldiers as *Ansi* or demi-gods, a title which was in time given by the Scandinavians to the legendary companions of Odin. The Roman general, Julianus, indeed almost destroyed the power of Decebalus, when he nearly annihilated the flower of the Dacian army in its own mountain fastnesses; but the ignoble Domitian hastened to regard the victory as an occasion for peace, decorating the Dacian prince with the royal insignia, sending to him many Roman engineers and artisans for the instruction of his warriors, and engaging to pay to him an annual tribute in the guise of a "donative." But when Trajan mounted the throne, this disgrace was amply revenged.

The commentaries on the two campaigns of Trajan against the Dacians, a work written by the emperor in imitation of the splendid "Commentaries" of Cæsar, have unfortunately perished; but the Column of Trajan in the Roman Forum remains to remind us of his glory and of the Dacian misfortune. Having constructed his magnificent bridge across the Danube which was to be of future strategic advantage to the Romans, having declared Dacia a Roman province, and having founded the city of Nicopolis as a memorial of his victories, Trajan resolved on a consolidation of the Roman power in Dacia by means of Roman colonization. The colonists, as we learn from Eutropius, were not taken from Italy alone; every part of the empire furnished its quota, and Ptolemy says that there were even fifteen tribes of western barbarians among them; but fortunately the

Latin blood, language, and customs predominated. Near the ruins of Sarmisagetusa, which are still seen near Varbel in modern Transylvania, the Roman city of Ulpia Trajana (to-day Varhely or Gradiska) soon arose; and Ptolemy speaks of such other Roman cities as Zerna, Napuca, Apulo, Pretoria Augusta, Augustia, Marcodava, and Jassy. These cities were all connected by excellent Roman roads; and they were all so many centres of Latin civilization, while they formed a barrier against the new barbarians who then menaced the eastern frontiers of the empire. Meanwhile a nation of so-called "Free Dacians" was being formed in the neighborhood of Roman Dacia by those Daco-Geti who had fled from the yoke of Rome to the territories beyond the Pruth, and had intermarried with the olden peoples of those regions, thus producing the stock which came to be known as "Gothic." During two centuries these Free Dacians or Goths combatted the Roman Dacians with varying results. Adrian formed the design of abandoning the province which had been conquered and created anew by that Trajan whose glory he envied; and in the year 118 he partly demolished the great emperor's bridge. However, the abandonment was not effected until 275, when Aurelian ordered the Latin and other Roman colonists to evacuate the region, and to settle in a new Dacia which he named after himself, and which was soon divided to two Dacias—the *Ripensis* along the Danube, and the *Mediterranea*. The Roman occupation of Dacia had lasted for 168 years, and that fact alone would account for its traces which are still visible in the land which is now and quite properly termed Roumania. But it must be remembered that very many of the Roman Dacians refused to obey the summons of Aurelian; they chose to remain in the land which they loved as their own, and by intermarriage with the barbarians they perpetuated a naturally modified Latin idiom, with its attendant Latin customs and habits of thought, among the future Moldavians and Wallachians. From the fourth century until the fourteenth, these people of the Danubian Principalities suffered from more or less lasting occupations of their country by Goths, Tervingians, Vandals, Huns, Alani, Avari, Gepidi, Lombards, Bulgarians, Cumani, Magyars, Slavs, Mongols, and Tartars. And nevertheless, he who speaks Italian is at home in Roumania. Every Roumanian regards the memory of Trajan with something like veneration; he terms the great Roman emperor his father, and he speaks of the Milky Way as "the path of Trajan." Ask a Roumanian peasant as to his nationality, and you will hear: "*Eo sum Rumen*"—a fairly good paraphrase of "*Civis Romanus sum*." And lest his children may forget their grand origin, surrounded as they are by Slavs and Germans, the Roumanian father teaches them that "*La un Rumen dece Sassi*—One

Roumanian is worth ten Saxons." At the end of a Psalter which was published by the metropolitan, Doristheus, during the reign of the "hospodar," Gregory Ghika II. (1726-1752), and intended for the instruction of the people of the Principalities, we read a kind of political Catechism in verse which begins with the question: "*Nemul t'eri Moldavi de unde derad'a?*"—Whence came the inhabitants of this Moldavian land?" And the answer is: "*D'in t'era Italii, tot omul se cred'a*"—From the land of Italy, as everyone knows." Then the instruction proceeds: "At first Flaccus, and then Trajan, led hither the ancestors of the present happy inhabitants of this country. They determined its frontiers, and the traces of their reign are still seen. The monuments left by Trajan still survive; *Turul Severinului* (the Tower of Severinus) is still unshakable." Following the investigations of D'Anville, the most accurate geographer of the eighteenth century, the best modern philologists admit that the *limba rumenesca*, in spite of its corruption from Slavic, Magyar, and Turkish sources, is Latin in its roots and inflexions—in fine, that it is substantially the archaic Latin, the *lingua rustica* which was spoken by the uneducated Romans in the days of Trajan. Even the name, Wallachia, indicates a land inhabited by people of Italian origin; for the Slavs have always applied the terms *Voľoch*, *Vloch*, *Olach*, and *Wlassi* to the Italians. Just as in their language, so in their customs the Roumanians evince their Italian origin; their funerals, dances, marriage ceremonies, all exhibit features which were common among the Romans of the Empire, but which have been known, even in Italy during the last few centuries, only by students of the recondite. Even the superstitions of the Roumanians indicate a Roman mythological, as well as a barbaric origin; and not only in Moldo-Wallachia, but wherever any considerable number of Roumanians are settled, as in the east of Hungary, in Transylvania, and in Bessarabia. As for the history of the Roumanians during the Middle Age, its obscurity was not dissipated even by the indefatigable labors of Sinclai (d. 1820), a Transylvanian Roumanian whose *Chronica Romanilor* or "Chronicle of the Roumanians," beginning with the days of Decebalus, and ending at 1739 (Jassy, 1808-1853), has not yet been supplanted as a source of information in the premises.*

REUBEN PARSONS.

Yonkers, N. Y.

* Consult: Cantù and Chantrel, *ubi supra*; Mnratori, "Novus Thesaurus Veterum Inscriptionum," p. 1001, Milan, 1739; Fabretti, "La Colonna Trajana," Rome, 1690; Ciacconio, "Historia Utriusque Belli Dacici, ex Columna Trajani," Rome, 1576; Piranesi, "La Colonna Trajana," Rome, 1770; Innocent III., "Regasta," VII., Epist. 8 ad Joannicium; La Civiltà Cattolica, "I. Principati Danubiani," Rome, 1859; "Lexicon Rumanescu-Latinescu-Ungarescu-Nemtescu," Buda, 1825; Dickinson, "Account of the Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia," London, 1820; Noyes, "Roumania, the Border Land of the Christian and the Turk," New York, 1857; Roeler, "Dacier und Romanen," Vienna, 1866; Engel, "Geschichte der Moldau und Walachei," Halle, 1804.

CARMELOGIA.

BY Contemplation man is united to God, so as to participate in the highest degree in the Divine Attributes and perfections, according to the words of St. Paul: "We all beholding the glory of the Lord with open face are transformed into the same image from glory to glory." It is the beholding which produces the transformation, for this gaze of the soul differs from the look of the bodily eyes inasmuch as it has an absorbing or assimilating power, so that it may be said to feed upon the object regarded. Cicero called contemplation the natural food of souls, and when used in this sense, tasting and seeing are synonymous. We may say equally "taste and see that the Lord is sweet" or see and taste the sweetness of the Lord. St. John says: "We shall be like Him because we shall see Him as He is." We are transformed by beholding. Blossius does not hesitate to call this mystical union of Contemplation the deification of the soul. Face to face in the absorbing gaze of love, the soul sees itself in God and God beholds Himself in the soul (*sui in Deo, Dei in se*) and the Divine rays form a bond of union, so that they are no longer two, but one, in attributes and perfections, [*Plane tota Dei color est quia essentia ejus essentia Dei perfusa est*], and thus is fulfilled the mandate of Heaven, "be ye perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect." The perfection of God is in seeing and loving Himself, the perfection of the soul is in seeing and loving God and himself in God. Christ has said: "He that loveth his life shall lose it," and the soul that loves itself as God loves it, will be lost to earth only to find itself by contemplation as conceived from all eternity in the operations of the Divine mind. One with God, lifted above space and time it will live in the eternal present of Him who is, seeing all things as He sees them, willing as He wills and thus truly and indeed "partaking of the Divine nature." Here is the accomplishment of the prayer of the Church uttered each day in the Sacrifice of the Mass at the mingling of the wine and water, the most perfect type of this mystical union which it foreshows. Therefore it is clear that Divine Contemplation is the highest act of man, for what act can be higher than the one which brings about the union of the Creator and creature and fulfils the end for which man was created—the contemplation of heavenly things.

And here let us make four considerations. Contemplation is an act—it is the highest act of man—it is useful, and it is necessary to the perfection of the individual and to the Church as a body, the mystical body of Christ.

I. Contemplation is an act. The quietists and false mystics would have it otherwise, but in this lies their error. "Truth is the repose of the intellect," but this repose is not inactive and without result. There are no exterior acts but interior ones are not wanting and speculation itself is the most noble action of the intelligence. As we have said, it is not an idle gaze but an absorbing one, and the absorbing of the Deity is the transformation or deification of the soul. St. Thomas distinctly says that mystical union cannot be called the prelude of eternal beatitude except when it is obtained by the *action* of the powers of the soul. The word passive as applied to contemplation deceives many, but rightly understood it is only a relative term to distinguish the more receptive from the more active operations of the soul in prayer. The soul is passive because the action of God is overwhelming, but in its most passive state the soul gives itself to God as actively and freely as God gives Himself to the soul, according to the words of Bossuet; or as Clement of Alexandria expresses it: "Man predestines God as God predestines man." This is also the teaching in clear terms of St. John of the Cross, the incontestable authority in mystical theology.

God is in eternal action. The Father beholding Himself begets the Son. Here is action at its fountain head. Here is the norm. Our every look must beget God in us or it is an empty gaze, the vacant stare of the fool. So it is that fruit is the test of contemplation. The solid virtues must give evidence of God present in the soul or the gaze is condemned as empty. The activity of contemplation is difficult to conceive, for in this life we always associate action with effort, and so it often happens that the soul, unconscious of effort, fears inertia and becomes the prey of a thousand terrors, whereas it should be at peace, praising God that it has been permitted to know the unconscious action (none the less potent) of the better life, where, as with the angels, activity is repose. The powers of the soul move easily and naturally in the presence of the Deity. The Child is at home in its Father's house, knowing not the strangeness of the wayfarer or the constraint of the guest of one day. The very unconsciousness of action may be the truest evidence of a healthy soul, as it certainly is of a healthy body. We need not sigh for the pangs of indigestion in the assimilation of our food. If we find ourselves strong for the duties of life we may suppose that we are well nourished though we may have felt nothing of the chemical changes wrought in us. So the soul in the stillness of Contemplation, feeding upon the Godhead, may be wholly unconscious of what is taking place within it, but simply knows that what was once difficult to perform is now as nothing because of a strength acquired by the intuitive gaze of love.

As science is becoming more sensitive and alert in its search into the mysteries of nature, it is learning of a cosmic force born in the midst of a silence and apparent stillness that would have failed to arrest the attention of minds in the past. The nursery tale of the man who heard the grass grow is not without its lesson. There is real action in that silent growth, real music in that transformation of the sunlight into the blade beneath our feet, though few ears are fine enough to catch it, and so it is only the trained ear of the mystic that can catch the vibration of the Spirit in Contemplation, can note the weaving of the light of the Godhead into the fabric of this earthly existence by which the only true growth is accomplished.

In Isaiah we read: "Seraphim stabant et volabant," "the Seraphim stand and fly," a contradiction in terms surely, and only to be explained by the fixedness of divine Contemplation whereby the spirit flies to God with a rapidity earth may not know. A faint image is seen in the eagle poised in midair with pinions outstretched and apparently as motionless as the sun upon which his gaze is fixed. He is held in air by a rapidity of motion beyond the power of the human eye to perceive. Contemplation then is not idleness; it is the intensity of action or it is false and nothing worth.

II. Contemplation is the highest act of man, for it anticipates the action of the blessed in heaven. Creation is composed of spirit and matter. The Angels are pure spirits, the universe is matter; between them stands forth man, lifted above the brute creation by his reason and made a little less than the Angels by his corporeal existence. In him we distinguish the inferior and superior nature. The terms express the relation of lower and higher. Contemplation has to do entirely with the superior faculties of the intelligence which man shares in common with the angels who are pure intelligences; therefore it elicits the highest acts of which man's nature is capable. In defending Mary our Lord said: "She hath chosen the better part and it shall not be taken from her." That which is eternal is above that which is of time as the heavens are above the earth. The "many things" of earth that absorbed the troubled attention of Martha will pass away when the earth is folded up as a garment. Medicine ceases with the grave. Astronomy fades with the stars that fall from heaven. Geology melts with the rocks on the last dread day, the naturalist must feel the earth slip through his fingers. Even Moral Theology ceases its inquisition when the hydra-headed monster, sin, is no more, and Dogma needs not its formula when Truth appears, divinely simple; but the face of Jesus that held the gaze of Mary is eternal and it shall not be taken from her. She has begun to do in time what she is to continue through

unending ages. She has found Him whom her soul loveth, she will hold Him and she will not let Him go until she bring Him into the house of the Mother that bore her. Not into the unstable tent of human speculation, raised for a night in this land of exile, but into the home of Divine Wisdom, the Mother of the Contemplative, a home not builded by hands, that lifts its unshaken columns unto the Eternal City of God. There the ministrations of Martha are no longer needed, the victims are slain, the wine is mingled, Mary has but to taste the plenty of the Lord. Verily she hath chosen the better part (*optimam*) and it shall not be taken from her. Few words are needed here, for Truth hath spoken and in one word expressed all.

III. Contemplation is useful. This statement cannot fail to rouse the antagonism of the materialist who measures utility by dollars and cents, by massive piles of architecture or by ever increasing statistics. Such minds are of the earth earthy. They must see, feel, touch and taste a substantial good or deny its existence. They know nothing of the spirit, of the interior senses; they would discover the soul of a man with the X-ray, or rob him of his belief. The riches of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God are as dross in their sight, and to them the proofs of Scripture are of no worth; but to the Christian this evidence in favor of the utility of Contemplation as a power in the world is overwhelming. The figure of Moses on the mountain is trite, but it is too apt to pass over in silence. We read in Exodus that when the Israelites fought against Amalec, Moses went up on to the mountain to pray, and that when his hands were lifted up Israel overcame and if he let them down Amalec was victorious. What a lesson for the materialist! Who, beholding the most valiant of Israel in the trappings of war, with horses and chariots, and spearmen and lances, and the cry of battle rousing their every energy for the combat, would believe that their victory depended not upon *their* prowess, but upon the lifted arms of an aged man too feeble to uphold his own frame, kneeling far above them on the mountain, his eyes fixed, not upon their feats of arms, but upon the heavens above, whence he drew strength for the combat: "*hi in curribus et hi in equis: nos autem in nomine Domini,*" etc. It was at the prayer of Elias, the father and model of contemplatives, that the fire descended from heaven to consume the holocaust. Human activity prepares the victim, lays the stones, pours the water and then ceases. It is the prayer of Contemplation that kindles a fire in God and draws from heaven the divine spark, the resistless flame that transforms the altar, the victim, the very stones into a kindred flame springing from earth to heaven and giving victory and glory to the people of God above their enemies.

Elias was a typical contemplative. Dwelling alone on his solitary mountain, he stood up as a fire in the divine Presence and burned his life out for the glory of God and the salvation of his people. Behold his power: he opened and closed the heavens; ruled the destinies of kings; plunged nations into famine and restored them to plenty; was master of life and death. Such is the power of Contemplation by which man shares in the divine attributes and perfections, putting on the strength of God Himself. Life is a warfare. The soul of every man is a field of contending forces. Perhaps it is for this reason that God has permitted so many of the records of war to come down to us in the inspired writings. He wishes to teach us the tactics of the spiritual combat, and we invariably find that the controlling power is prayer. In the holy war of the Machabees the people were armed, "not with defense of shield and spear," but with "exhortations, and the vision of Onias, a good and virtuous man, holding up his hands in prayer for them," and Jeremias "admirable for age and glory environed with great beauty and majesty praying much for the people and for the holy city," and when they encountered the foe "it was while calling upon God by prayer;" so fighting with their hands, but calling upon God in their hearts they went to victory.

When schism rent the Jewish camp and the sons of Core stood up in defiance of authority, "a blameless man made haste to pray for the people, and bringing forth the shield of his ministry, prayer, and by incense making supplication, withstood the wrath and put an end to the calamity." Prayer puts fetters on Omnipotence. How often do we find these mysterious words of the Creator to His creatures, "pray *not* for this people that I may destroy them." He cannot strike when the hands of the just are lifted up before Him.

St. Augustine in his magnificent eulogy of the monks shows his appreciation of their life when he says: "I shall not speak of those who, hidden in deserts from the eyes of men, enjoy the consideration of the God who has captivated their affections, and taste in the Contemplation of His beauty the happiness reserved to the saints alone."

According to the judgment of certain persons, these deserters from the world have separated themselves too completely from human affairs, but we do not appreciate how *useful* to us by their prayers and by the example of their lives are these souls whose bodies we no longer see. It would be superfluous to discuss the point, the fact is evident, and sanctity so eminent excites our admiration and homage by its brilliancy alone. Our words would add nothing to it. Blossius declares that a soul united to God is *useful* to the entire Church. "Anima Deo pure unita toti Ecclesiae est utilissima." And the utility of a soul in the Church is exactly

in proportion to its degree of union with God. St. John of the Cross teaches this when he says: "One instant of pure love of God is more profitable to the Church than all good works together, though it may seem as if nothing were done." And again he says clearly: "The closer the union with God, the greater the work accomplished." St. Augustine says, "where there is nothing, there is God." The life of the true contemplative is a supernatural life growing out of the destruction of every foreign element, every admixture of self, every material alloy, so that the soul in its base simplicity, its nothingness, may be one with the simplicity of God, and where God is there is power. "Blessed is the soul that loves," cries out St. John of the Cross, "for it has made a captive of God who obeys its good pleasure."

After considering the utility of Contemplation as a power, let us consider its utility as an instrument—a means to an end. God needs no instrument. He can act directly now as when, before the creation of the world, He had no tool save His Omnipotence; but having created instruments, it is His will to use them, and it is not for man to ask why. His will is His law, and we have only to bow. Christ has said: "The Father worketh and I work." Christ is the head of the mystical body and all its members *must* work with Him in God. We find many examples of the dependence of the Creator upon the action of the creature. When the Master looked over the fields white to harvest He said: "Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest to send forth laborers." "Pray!" Did not the Father know the need; why did He wait for prayer to move Him to action? Inscrutable mystery only to be explained by the surpassing love of a God, who would lift His creatures to the dignity of co-workers with Him in the marvels of Redemption. If it be true that the Father waits for prayer to send forth laborers, it is equally true that without prayer the fields will grow dry and sere beneath the blaze of Divine wrath and never know the saving touch of the reaper. O the responsibility of man for his fellow man! If that be not a plea for the utility of prayer, can one be found to move the unthinking hearts of men? The figure of this apostolic instrumentality of Contemplation is found in *Isaias*, where we read of the seraph who took with tongs a live coal from the altar of God to cleanse the lips of the prophet. By prayer the contemplative carries fire from the face of God to touch the lips of the priest. God needed not the seraph or the tongs, but He hath made His angels ministers and He hath made souls His ministers as well, and it is His will to use them.

The Apostle recognized this when he said: "Praying withal for us, that God may open unto us a door of speech to speak the mystery of Christ." Prayer is the key that opened the door, closed

without it. It is true God is Master and can enter through closed doors, but He does not. He stands and knocks; the key is in our hands. Again, the Apostle exhorts to "prayer and watching, with all instance and supplication for all the saints and for *me*, that speech may be given me, that I may open my mouth with confidence to make known the mystery of the Gospel." Here is the apostolic utility of Contemplation as a means to the extension of the Kingdom of God.

St. Thomas, the Angel of the Schools, tells us that in difficulties of Scripture he gave himself to prayer. Prayer was the bridge that spanned the chasm between his finite intellect and the infinite wisdom of God. It was the sure means to an end according to the words of Ecclesiasticus: "I have sought for wisdom openly in my prayer."

IV. Contemplation is not only useful, it is more. It is necessary. A thing may be called necessary when no other thing will supply its place and when it is the only possible means to a desired end. The necessity of Contemplation to the perfection of man's being is proven indirectly from his very nature. Being lifted above the animals by his intellectual faculties, it is necessary to the perfection of his being that he use these faculties and not bury them in the earth of his lower nature, according to Aristotle (10 Ethics, c. 718). This agrees well with the words of St. Gregory in his homily on the talents. The one talent which stands alone is intellect, that *one* more than embracing all the others. Woe to the servant who, digging in the earth, hides it in fear. Exterior darkness is his portion, and those who, having five talents, received less than he, receive also the light that he refused. His one talent was *necessary* to his salvation.

Seneca speaks as a Christian as well as a philosopher when he makes a magnificent act of thanksgiving to God, not only for having made him to overcome the monsters of his passions, but for having admitted him to the most intimate mysteries of nature, and of the heavens, and to the contemplation of the Divinity. The philosophers went further, they thought that the happiness of this life lies in the perfect contemplation of the most excellent intelligible object, that is to say of God. Aristotle affirms this positively, and he gives the reason that, according to the confession of philosophers, the natural happiness of the present life should consist in the most perfect act of the intelligence, which a reasonable and intellectual creature can bring to bear on its last natural end—which is God. This agrees perfectly with the teaching of theologians, who affirm that there is in Purgatory a peculiar pain called languor, which is inflicted upon those who have not sufficiently hungered for the con-

templation of the vision of God in this life. Is this not proof that it is *necessary* to the perfection of man's nature that he develop these higher faculties here below, for were he perfect he could at once enter the Divine Presence? When a man dies he is not radically changed. He is perfected and alas! too often he has to await a long development. Gerson maintains that the life of a reasonable creature lies chiefly in the action of the intelligence; therefore one can say that contemplatives alone have life, because they alone take the food and drink that gives it, while others, like brutes, do not lift up their souls to things above. They alone have a complete life who seek this nourishment in Contemplation. In other words, it is necessary to their development, they are imperfect, immature, "infants of a hundred years," without it. A man may have all natural perfections of beauty and grace, may be a Solon of earthly wisdom, but if the spirit within him be not alive by intercourse with his Creator, he is an undeveloped being, a sepulchre of death. The necessity of Contemplation is indicated by the practice of the Church in establishing contemplative orders from time immemorial. The Church is the organ of the Holy Spirit. Her economy is divine. She cannot suffer an unnecessary encumbrance. Through all the ages as needs arose, orders arose to fill them. Devoted men and women were ready to give their labors and their lives at the call of their fellow beings or of the Church. The need ceased and the order melted away and disappeared, save for the stars that lingered in the firmament of the saints. What is the action of the Church to-day in regard to contemplative orders? Does she look upon them as effete and withdraw from them her favors, hastening their destruction? Nay, she hears the voice of her Spouse: "You are to pray always and not to faint," and hence her action in regard to the contemplative is that of the merchant who has found the treasure. She guards her pearl of price, builds walls about it, puts upon them bulwarks of silver, sets seven watchmen upon them, makes laws, promulgates censures, lavishes blessings; all to guard and keep the life of prayer in her heart of hearts. Would this be her action, with the multiplied needs of suffering humanity clamoring in her ears, did she not realize the *necessity* of unremitting prayer and praise? God has rights. The world spurns them. His Spouse, the Church, recognizes them and gives Him what He demands, unceasing homage. The undivided and enraptured attention of love.

Contemplative prayer is necessary in the Church for the salvation of innumerable souls, who may be reached in no other way. There are souls upon earth at this moment who have no channel of grace open to them save the prayer of the contemplative. Prayer, it must be remembered, is a distinct channel of grace for souls. The

sacraments are aqueducts of divine life, flowing out of Paradise, but what of those souls who have not the sacraments and whose hearts are closed by sin to the action of vivifying grace. Souls dead to God and buried in the grave of their own passions, so that even the zeal of an apostle is appalled at the mere thought of resurrection and cries out with Martha in dismay. Mary is silent, but she looks at Jesus and He weeps and cries out: "Lazarus come forth."

There are regions in the dark continent ruled by diabolic power. Horrors exist that cannot be thought of without a shudder. Are those innumerable multitudes of souls, far out of the reach of the most intrepid missionary, to be lost to the Church forever? Hear the voice of the Master: "This kind can be cast out *only* by prayer and fasting." The prayer of the contemplative is then a *necessity* in the Church of God.

Once again let us look upon Mary at the Feet of Jesus, and let us hear Him say: "One thing is necessary." This "one thing" is necessary to all men in a greater or lesser degree. Some have made it their *all*, and we have tried to show the nobility, the utility and the necessity of their action in the Church, for (and here we are brought back to our opening sentence) by Contemplation man is united to God, so as to participate in the highest degree in the Divine attributes and perfections. The Face of Jesus is the expression of the Divinity, "he that seeth Me seeth the Father;" the beholding of the Divinity is the transformation or deification of the soul; the operations of the soul transformed in God, "are the operations of the Holy Ghost, and consequently Divine." and of infinite value to the Church of God.

THE TWO STABATS.

I. THE SPECIOSA.

THE *Stabat Mater dolorosa* and its imitation (or parody, as some hymnologists are inclined to call it), the *Stabat Mater speciosa*, are companion pieces of not a little interest to the student of mediæval hymnody. They are vivid paintings of the Manger and the Cross, of Bethlehem and Golgotha. Using the same metrical and stanzaic form, and couched in almost identical phraseology, they treat of themes differing from each other by the whole range of human emotion and religious sentiment; and each is nevertheless found to be an adequate expression of the soul of the singer, and to possess an atmosphere appropriate to its subject. If

the *Stabat Mater speciosa* were read without reference to the other companion hymn, it would satisfy every requirement of the critical faculty; not, indeed, that it is perfect, like its companion hymn, but that whatever it lacks of perfection would probably escape notice if it were not contrasted with the absolute harmony and beauty of the other. In saying this, we are not taking account of the crudenesses of metre and rhymic defects which are so easily discerned in the *Speciosa*; for we assume that the text has come down to us considerably altered for the worse through the carelessness of the scribe or whatever other accidents may be involved in that "wreck of time" of which Bacon speaks, that *injuria temporum* which Cicero laments. It is quite obvious that some such hurtful influence has been at work defacing the hymn, for its occasional crudeness is not that of an inexpert workman, laboring heavily with his instruments, but that of a hasty copyist, dropping a syllable here and a whole word there, and perhaps interverting the stanzas and so unconsciously altering the rhymic scheme.

The two hymns have an added interest in the perplexing question of authorship. This question will be treated more fully in connection with each hymn; but it may be proper to remark in this place that the ascription of both hymns to Jacopo de' Benedetti, the "wise fool" of Todi, has given to hymnologists an opportunity, eagerly snatched, to rehearse the striking stories related by Luke Wadding of the extraordinary mediæval convert who passed "from the cloister to a prison, from the prison to the *cultus* of the altar." Ozanam devotes forty pages of his work on the Franciscan poets to a brilliant summary of his life, and fifty-five additional pages to a consideration of his writings. These are mostly Italian poems, indeed, although his reputed authorship of the Stabats doubtless served to throw over them a glamor of interest which otherwise they might have lacked. A more searching spirit of criticism inclines at the present day to the opinion that Jacopo (or Jacopone, the "big James," as his townsmen began to call him in derision after his assumed foolishness had ceased to be a nine-days' wonder) did not write any of the Latin poems so confidently ascribed to him. This critical doubt is perhaps a needless scepticism, for the *Cur mundus militat* has an unassailed tradition in its favor. Not so the Stabats; but hymnologists will not be eager to renounce an ascription which finds so much added flavor in the career of him who literally made himself a fool for Christ's sake. The present page could be enlivened very much by a judicious extraction from Ozanam or Wadding of the salient features of Jacopone's life, illustrated with choice instances of his saintly follies, his deep and tender mysticism, his political misadventures, his imprisonment, his prophecy of liberation,

his picturesque death, his *cultus* on the altars of his order. If, however, he be not the author of the Stabats, interest must give place to relevancy; and we refrain. One incident in his life should, nevertheless, be touched upon, if only for the reason that our separated brethren are apt to find in it a new opportunity for assailing the memory of Boniface the Eighth with fresh obloquy. For instance, Trench, who excludes from his collection both Stabats (and selects only the *Cur mundus militat*) because he cannot tolerate their language in reference to our Lady, has this to say: "The freedom with which, in his vernacular poems, Jacopone treated the abuses of his time, above all those of the hierarchy, drew on him long imprisonments, and he only went out of prison when his persecutor, Boniface the Eighth, whom to have had for an adversary was itself an honour, went in." Dr. Coles remarks, in the Proem to his translation of the Stabat: "Boniface VIII., who, prior to his elevation to the papal chair, had lived in friendly relations with Jacopone, having been deeply offended by some sharp censures directed against him, threw him into prison, at the same time suspended over him the excommunication." And Duffield continues the chapter of abuse as follows: "Jacoponus also interests us in view of his Protestant spirit. He never fancied Boniface VIII., and when that Pope had a dream in which he saw a great bell without a tongue, and consulted the keen-witted friar upon its meaning, he received the reproof valiant, 'Know, your holiness,' said the undaunted monk, 'that the great size of the bell signifies the pontifical power which embraces the world. But take heed lest the tongue be that good example which you will not give.' For this and other liberties which he took it is no wonder that he presently found himself in a prison, where he suffered everything patiently, and announced that he would go out when Boniface was ready to come in."

Now it is a pity that, in borrowing so much from Ozanam, these commentators did not place themselves further in his debt by digesting his explanation of the imprisonment of an unquestionably holy friar. The history of the Church shows us that occasionally good men have been found on a side which subsequent events, or a calm estimate of a distant period, will demonstrate as a wrong side. However much they erred in matters of fact, they were conscientious in their action. How Jacopone managed to array himself with interests alien to justice and correct obedience, is not illustrated by these commentators just quoted. Ozanam's omitted *rationale* of the transaction is therefore supplied here. Although it is not a very brief account, the tactics of some of our separated brethren render its insertion a matter of necessity. In the following account of the transaction, we shall partly condense and partly translate from Ozanam.

On his election to the papal chair, Boniface VIII. was everywhere recognized as a man of energetic character, profoundly versed in Canon and Civil Law. He was very clearly a statesman; but this fact seemed, perhaps, to offer some ground for a fear lest the instincts of a secular prince should consort but poorly with the gentle sway of the priest, and a canonist's respect for abstract justice should overshadow the claims of mercy. Perhaps, says Ozanam, apprehensions like these were filling the mind of Jacopone when, as it chanced, the Pope consulted him about a strange dream in which he saw a clapperless bell whose circumference enclosed the whole earth. The saintly friar interpreted the bell as the pontifical power, and the absence of the clapper as a warning to the Pope to give good example to his flock. The sinister presages seemed to be realized to the eyes of Jacopone when Boniface, revoking the concessions made by his predecessor to the party of stricter Franciscans (who had been allowed to separate themselves from their brethren of laxer observance), suppressed them as a distinct party and bade them return to obedience of their former superiors of the "Conventual" party. This was a heavy blow to the ardent reformers of the Franciscan Order; and it happened at a time when strange rumors were spreading to the effect that Boniface had extorted the abdication of Celestine V. and had confined him in a prison to die at the hands of tormentors. Now there was no truth in these rumors; but they were sown by discontent and reaped by credulity; and they led souls whom they deceived to ask whether such a man as Boniface should be considered the Vicar of Christ, and whether the abdication of Celestine were lawful. These questions were echoing from all parts of Italy, when, on the 10th of May, 1297, two enemies of the Pope, the Cardinals James and Peter Colonna, gathered a small number of their adherents in the castle of Lunghezza, near Rome, and dared solemnly to protest against Boniface as an usurper, appealing at the same time to the judgment of the next General Council. Dupuy gives the names of those who were present; and of the eight, five names are those of archdeacons or canons of Rheims, Rouen, Chartres, Embrun, Senlis. Ozanam thinks he can see in this fact a trace of the statecraft of Philip the Fair, whose agents are already seen conferring with the enemies of Boniface, long before the strife between the two had been signalized by deeds of violence. Jacopone's name appeared as a witness in the document drawn up, and of course he lay under the same excommunication as that which fell on the Colonnas and their party. He had been residing for three months in his convent at Palestrina, which fief was the principal stronghold of the Colonnas. It was in this hotbed of sedition that the vilest rumors sprung up and flourished; here it was that Jacopone

passed judgment on a question of such great importance. And so it happened that, by one of those illusions which God permits to humble the wisdom of man, the saintly friar who had won laurels in his worldly days in the domain of jurisprudence, who had atoned for his worldly life by the harshest penances, and who withal had fortified his mind by a study of theology, fell into error in a matter of supreme importance. Of the satire credited to him, with which he emphasized his mistake, doubtless a half was the after production of others, while its inspiration came from the Colonnas. But it raised up many enemies of Boniface, and rehearsed rumors that were found afterwards as items in the indictment drawn up against Boniface. Such a course of insubordination and of ecclesiastico-political satire, merited punishment when, in 1298, Boniface had reduced Palestrina to submission; and Jacopone expiated in prison a mistake which was doubtless one of the head rather than of the heart. Who shall say that Boniface acted unjustly in the matter? It may be granted, indeed, that however great the provocation, justice might well have been tempered with that mercy which has always been the distinguishing feature of papal activity. But who could gather from the words of Trench, or of Dr. Coles, or of the Rev. Mr. Duffield, that Boniface had had such heavy and long-continued provocation, and that the punishment meted out to Jacopone was legally a just one? One would fancy from their comment on the incident that the poor friar was thrown into prison for some little indiscretion of language or for a harmless satirical skit against the "abuses of the time, above all those of the hierarchy," or for "some sharp censures directed against" Boniface; and that, for some such genial utterances, the Pope was going about like a roaring lion, seeking whom he might devour.

Now it may fairly be confessed that all this discussion cannot plead much relevancy to the subject of the *Stabat Mater*, whose authorship can be ascribed to several names with about as much probability as to that of Jacopone. But hymnologists have an amiable trick of swelling out their books with biographical notices (sometimes quite lengthy ones) of men for whose authorship of a hymn only a probable claim can be put forth. And so it happens that we are treated to biographies which are, indeed, interesting enough at times, but which only rarely have an obvious appropriateness in the account of a hymn of much-disputed authorship. As our readers have doubtless come across such biographical notices of Jacopone in connection with the *Stabat Mater*, we have allowed ourselves some space to correct one glaring injustice so apt to appear in them. We may now dismiss this subject with the following words of Ozanam: "The memory of Boniface VIII., unworthily calumniated, has been honor-

ably defended by Mgr. Wiseman (*Dublin Review*, XV. No. 22) and by Tosti (*Storia di Bonifazio VIII.*). . . . Mansi seems to me to have characterized Boniface with perfect impartiality: 'Ingentes animi dotes contulit, quanquam saeculari principatui quam ecclesiastico aptiores' (*Annal. Eccles.*, ad ann. 1303)."

Coming now to the *Stabat Mater dolorosa* and its companion hymn, we are confronted with the strongest possible witness to their poetical and hymnodal power in the fact that our separated brethren have devoted much attention to their worthy rendition into English verse, while at the same time inveighing harshly against their "Mariolatry." In commenting on the hymns, we shall gather some of these expostulatory tributes into their appropriate place for each hymn; but meanwhile it may be interesting here to note the attitude of Dr. Newman to the devotion of the Catholic heart towards our Lady. His confession, in the *Apologia*, of the strong bias he felt against the Church in this matter, and of the difficulty it placed in his pathway towards Catholicity, coupled with his continued dissent from the phraseology of Italian devotion towards the Blessed Virgin, which he felt even after his conversion, will perhaps teach us gentleness towards our mistaken critics. He says (Chap. iv., 2): "Now it must be observed that the writings of St. Alfonso, as I knew them by the extracts commonly made from them, prejudiced me as much against the Roman Church as anything else, on account of what was called their 'Mariolatry;' but there was nothing of the kind in this book [The "Sermons" of St. Alphonsus]. I wrote to ask Dr. Russell whether anything had been left out in the translation; he answered that there certainly were omissions in one Sermon about the Blessed Virgin. This omission, in the case of a book intended for Catholics, at least showed that such passages as are found in the works of Italian Authors were not acceptable to every part of the Catholic world. Such devotional manifestations in honour of our Lady had been my great *crux* as regards Catholicism; I say frankly, I do not fully enter into them now; I trust I do not love her the less, because I cannot enter into them. They may be fully explained and defended; but sentiment and taste do not run with logic: they are suitable for Italy, but they are not suitable for England. But, over and above England, my own case was special; from a boy I had been led to consider that my Maker and I, His creature, were the two beings, luminously such, *in rerum natura*. I will not here speculate, however, about my own feelings. Only this I know full well now, and did not know then, that the Catholic Church allows no image of any sort, material or immaterial, no dogmatic symbol, no rite, no sacrament, no Saint, not even the Blessed Virgin herself, to come between the soul and its Creator. It is face to face, "solus

cum solo," in all matters between man and his God. He alone creates; He alone has redeemed; before His awful eyes we go to death; in the vision of Him is our eternal beatitude. . . . The devotions then to Angels and Saints as little interfered with the incommunicable glory of the Eternal, as the love which we bear our friends and relations, our tender human sympathies, are inconsistent with that supreme homage of the heart to the Unseen, which really does but sanctify and exalt, not jealously destroy, what is of earth."

This last sentence of Dr. Newman seems to have anticipated the very words of Dr. Coles' objection to the Stabat: "Not only is Mary made the object of religious worship, but the incommunicable attributes of the Deity are freely ascribed to her." "The devotion then to Angels and Saints," says Newman, "as little interfered with the incommunicable glory of the Eternal, as the love which we bear our friends and relations, our tender human sympathies, are inconsistent with that supreme homage of the heart to the Unseen, which really does but sanctify and exalt, not jealously destroy, what is of earth." Is the exegesis a fair one, which measures the language of devotion with a foot-rule? which applies mathematical tests to the tender outpourings of love?

The words of Dr. Newman will serve to illustrate the general mental attitude of the non-Catholic world towards the warm outpourings of Catholic devotion. And yet the very motto of Cardinal Newman—"the heart speaks to the heart," *Cor ad cor loquitur*—is perhaps the best vindication of our attitude toward the Blessed Virgin, the Saints, the instruments of the Passion, and the like, objected to by Protestant hymnologists. Dr. Trench voices the general complaint in the Preface to the first edition of his "Sacred Latin Poetry:" "The aim of the present volume is to offer to members of the English Church a collection of the best sacred Latin poetry, such as they shall be able entirely and heartily to accept and approve—a collection, that is, in which they shall not be evermore liable to have the current of their sympathies checked, by coming upon that, which, however beautiful as poetry, out of higher respects they must reject and condemn—in which, too, they shall not fear that snares are being laid for them, to entangle them unawares in admiration for aught which is inconsistent with their faith and fealty to their own spiritual mother. Such being the idea of the volume it is needless to say that all hymns which in any way imply the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation are excluded. In like manner all are excluded, which involve any creature worship, or which speak of the Mother of the Lord in any other language than that which scripture has sanctioned, and our Church adopted. So, too, all asking of the suffrages of the saints, all addresses to the Cross calcu-

lated to encourage superstition, that is, in which any value is attributed to the material wood in which it is used otherwise than in the Epistles of St. Paul, namely, as a figure of speech by which we ever and only understand Him that hung upon it; all these have been equally refused a place." Cardinal Wiseman, writing in 1842 on Catholic "Prayers and Prayer-books," complains that the English habit of praying only from the head had chilled the warmth of even the Catholic heart: "The so-called Reformation, wherever it fell, blighted all warmth and tenderness, and introduced a totally new system of prayer. . . . Now it has seemed to us as though some of the leaven which, while it fermented, soured the sweet bread of old devotion among our neighbors, had unfortunately slipped in among ourselves. . . . It appears to us as though most of our modern English prayers came too much from the head. Not that the heart was wanting in those who composed them—far are we from thinking so; but they feared to let it play; they put it in fetters, they bound up its feelings too much, lest they should turn imprudent. The consequence is, that they bear a certain reasoning, argumentative air, that smacks of a sadly controversial age. If we may venture to use such a phrase, we *memorialize* the Almighty, instead of praying to Him."

The frigid example of Trench was followed by other translators of the hymns, who, however, were for the most part too much overcome by the beauty of the hymns to exclude them from their collections, and were content to let them pass with a protest ranging through the whole diapason of a cold piety, from a polite disclaimer to downright abuse, but nearly always with an obvious misconception of the Catholic doctrine and Catholic attitude towards the themes of the hymns. While Newman "could not enter into" the language of merely unliturgical and private Italian devotion, and was not speaking at all of the liturgical prayers and hymns of the Church, the Protestant objectors warily search for passages in the liturgical hymns, which might yield to a laborious criticism some points for disclaimer or abuse. Dr. Coles, for instance, cannot refrain from translating the *Stabat Mater dolorosa*; but, although he was not a divine, but a physician, he utters his protest in part as follows: "Not only is Mary made the object of religious worship, but the incommunicable attributes of the Deity are freely ascribed to her. Her agency is invoked as if she were the third person of the Trinity, or had powers coördinate and equal. Plainly it is the province of the Holy Ghost, and not of any creature, to 'work in us to will and to do;' to effect spiritual changes; to 'take of the things of Christ and show them unto us,'—and yet these are the very things which she herself is asked to accomplish for the suppliant. 'Fac,' alone, aside from potential equivalents, is used at least nine times—

a form of expression manifestly inappropriate unless addressed to one capable of acts causal and original and therefore divine. Not content, it seems, with making her a fountain of supernatural influence, a succedaneum of the Holy Ghost, her efficiency is extended to the performance likewise of the work assigned to the Son—

Per te, Virgo, sim defensus
In die Judicii,—

an expression of reliance on her rather than on Him to ward off in that day the demands of divine justice. Mariolatry here culminates. It could not well be carried farther."

It is good to know the worst word of our objectors; and there is much reason to fear that the lawyerlike pleading of Dr. Coles does in truth represent the unspoken view of very many Protestants. But what shall we say to such a wooden exegesis? The Russian nobleman of Dr. Newman's lecture would seem to be the clearest possible rejoinder. That nobleman, in the ingenious parable of Newman, had come across a copy of "Blackstone's Commentaries on the Laws of England," and after diligent perusal was prepared to speak on the "atheistical tenets and fiendish maxims of John-Bullism." His audience listens with bated breath to the argument: "Now I should say, gentlemen, that this book . . . is . . . of judges, and lawyers, and privy councillors, and justices of the peace, and police magistrates, and clergy, and country gentlemen, the guide, and I may say, the gospel. I open the book, gentlemen, and what are the first words which meet my eyes? 'The King can do no wrong.' I beg you to attend, gentlemen, to this most significant assertion; one was accustomed to think that no child of man had the gift of impeccability; one had imagined that, simply speaking, impeccability was a divine attribute; but this British Bible, as I may call it, distinctly ascribes an absolute sinlessness to the King of Great Britain and Ireland. . . . But this is far from all: the writer goes on actually to ascribe to the Sovereign (I tremble while I pronounce the words) *absolute perfection*; for he speaks thus: 'The law ascribes to the King in his political capacity *absolute perfection*; the King can do no wrong. . . . The King, moreover, is not only incapable of doing wrong, but even of *thinking* wrong!! he can never do an *improper thing*; in him is no folly or weakness!!!' . . . The English Sovereign distinctly claimed, according to the same infamous work, to be the '*fount of justice*.' . . . The Queen, a woman, only did acts of reparation and restitution as a matter of *grace*! . . . All his hearers knew perfectly well that nature was one thing, grace another; and yet here was a poor child of clay claiming to be the fount, not only of justice, but of grace. She was making herself a

first cause of not merely natural, but spiritual excellence, and doing nothing more or less than simply emancipating herself from her Maker." This is but a part of the zealous nobleman's indictment against the British Constitution. He is made by Newman to speak in the logic which is used by Dr. Coles; indeed, one might almost fancy that Newman was prophetically anticipating the very words and argument of Coles. The "she" of Newman is Queen Victoria; the "she" of Coles is the Blessed Virgin. "Her agency is invoked," says Coles, "as if she were the third person of the Trinity, or had powers coördinate and equal." Similarly did Newman's Russian Count speak of Queen Victoria: "She was making herself a first cause of not merely natural, but spiritual excellence, and doing nothing more or less than simply emancipating herself from her Maker."

Newman's long allegory or parable is something more than pleasant banter; it is really a profound analysis of the objections of Protestant hymnologists to our Catholic mediæval hymns. But to answer Dr. Coles, not by a parable, but by frigid logic, it needs but to deny his calm assertion that "fac" is "a form of expression manifestly inappropriate unless addressed to one capable of acts causal and original and therefore divine." It is used a hundred times a day in ordinary language with a connotation entirely different from that to which Coles would restrict it. It is surely needless to encumber the statement of such a fact with the obvious illustrations so familiar to any one who will review his own words, or the words of others. There is simply no "Mariolatry" in the grand hymn, save to a mind such as the Russian Count possessed: "If the Queen 'cannot do wrong,' if she 'cannot even think wrong,' if she is 'absolute perfection,' if she has 'no folly, no weakness,' if she is the 'fount of justice,' if she is the 'fount of grace,' if she is simply 'above law,' if she is 'omnipotent,' what wonder that the lawyers of John-Bullism should also call her 'sacred!' what wonder that they should speak of her as 'majesty!' what wonder that they should speak of her as a 'superior being!' Here again I am using the words of the book I hold in my hand. 'The people' (my blood runs cold while I repeat them) 'are led to consider their Sovereign in the light of a superior being.'"

Before treating the Stabats separately,¹ it should prove acceptable to print them in parallel columns for the purpose of comparison. Although the Speciosa was apparently moulded on the Dolorosa, it will be found able to stand as a substantive, rather than merely an accidental, hymn; for the expression of joy seems to be quite adequate, and the vividness of the scene-painting fully satisfying.

¹ The Speciosa will be considered in the present paper, and the Dolorosa in a succeeding issue.

THE DOLOROSA.

THE SPECIOSA.

(Parallel verses from various texts.) (Slightly rearranged for comparison.)

Stabat mater dolorosa
Juxta crucem lacrimosa,
Dum pendebat filius;
Cuius animam gementem,
Contristatam et dolentem,
Pertransivit gladius.

O quam tristis et afflicta
Fuit illa benedicta
Mater Unigeniti!
Quae moerebat et dolebat
Pia mater, dum videbat
Nati poenas inclyti.

Quis est homo qui non fleret,
Matrem Christi si videret
In tanto supplicio?
Quis non posset contristari,
Christi matrem contemplari
Dolentem cum filio?

Pro peccatis suae gentis
Vidit Jesum in tormentis
Et flagellis subditum;
Vidit suum dulcem natum
Moriendo desolatum,
Dum emisit spiritum.

(No parallel verses to be found in
any known text of the *Stabat mater*
dolorosa.)

Eia mater, fons amoris,
Me sentire vim doloris
Fac ut tecum lugeam;
Fac ut ardeat cor meum
In amando Christum Deum,
Ut sibi complaceam.

Sancta mater, istud agas:
Crucifixi fige plagas
Cordi meo valide;
Tui nati vulnerati,
Tam dignati pro me pati,
Poenas mecum divide.

Fac me vere tecum flere,
Crucifixo condolere,
Donec ego vixero;

Stabat mater speciosa
Juxta foenum gaudiosa,
Dum jacebat filius;
Cuius animam gaudentem,
Laetabundam ac ferventem,
Pertransivit júbilus.

O quam laeta et beata
Fuit illa immaculata
Mater Unigeniti!
Quae gaudebat et ridebat,
Exsultabat, cum videbat
Nati partum inclyti.

Quisnam est qui non gauderet
Matrem Christi si videret
In tanto solatio?
Quis non posset collaetari,
Christi matrem contemplari
Ludentem cum filio?

Pro peccatis suae gentis
Christum vidit cum jumentis,
Et algori subditum;
Vidit suum dulcem natum
Vagientem, adoratum,
Vili diversorio.

Nato Christo in praesepe,
Coeli cives canunt laete
Cum immenso gaudio;
Stabat senex cum puella,
Non cum verbo nec loquela,
Stupescens cordibus.

Eia mater, fons amoris,
Me sentire vim ardoris,
Fac ut tecum sentiam;
Fac, ut ardeat cor meum
In amando Christum Deum,
Ut sibi complaceam.

Sancta mater, istud agas:
Parvi introducas plagas,
Cordi meo valide;
Tui nati coelo lapsi,
Jam dignati foeno nasci,
Poenas mecum divide.

Fac me vere congaudere,
Jesulino cohaerere,
Donec ego vixero;

Juxta crucem tecum stare
Et me tibi sociare
In planctu desidero.

In me sistat dolor tui,
Crucifixo fac me frui,
Dum sum in exilio;
Hunc dolorem fac me moestum,
Nec me facias alienum
Ab hoc desiderio.

Virgo virginum praeclara,
Mihi jam non sis amara;
Fac me tecum plangere;
Fac ut portem Christi mortem,
Passionis fac consortem,
Et plagas recolare.

Fac me plagis vulnerari,
Fac me cruce inebriari,
Et cruore filii.
Inflammatum et accensus,
Per te, Virgo, sim defensum
In die iudicii.

Fac me cruce custodiri,
Morte Christi praemuniri,
Confoveri gratia.
Quando corpus morietur,
Fac ut animae donetur
Paradisi gloria.

(No parallel verses to be found.)

Juxta stramen tecum stare
Et me tibi sociare
In foeno desidero.

In me sistat ardor tui;
Puerino fac me frui
Dum sum in exilio.
Hunc ardorem fac communem;
Ne me facias immunem
Ab hoc desiderio.

Virgo virginum praeclara,
Mihi jam non sis amara;
Fac me parvum rapere:
Fac ut portem pulchrum, fortem
Qui nascendo vicit mortem,
Volens vitam tradere.

Fac me tecum satiari,
Nato tuo inebriari,
Stantem in tripudio.
Inflammatum et accensus,
Obstupescit omnis sensus
Tali de commercio.

Fac me nato custodiri,
Verbo Dei praemuniri,
Conservari gratia:
Quando corpus morietur,
Fac ut animae donetur
Tui nati visio.

Omnes stabulum amantes
Et pastores vigilantes
Pernocantes sociant:
Per virtutem nati tui
Ora ut electi sui
Ad patriam veniant.

To make the comparison closer, as well as to remedy some obvious and unnecessary crudenesses in metre and rhyme, the text of the *Speciosa* just given has been amended according to the suggestions of various critics. The emendations will be considered in connection with the comment on the hymn itself, which now follows.

STABAT MATER SPECIOSA.

The title of the Hymn immediately suggests the other more famous one, *Stabat Mater dolorosa*, and would naturally lead a reader to expect some similarity between the hymns as well in structure as in thought. A close comparison of the two will, however, surprise

him with an almost complete identity of phrase as well as of stanzaic form; e. g.:

MATER SPECIOSA.

Stabat Mater speciosa,
Juxta foenum gaudiosa,
Dum jacebat Parvulus;
Cujus animam gaudentem,
Laetabundam ac ferventem
Pertransivit júbilus.

O quam laeta et beata
Fuit illa immaculata
Mater Unigeniti:
Quae gaudebat et ridebat,
Exultabat, cum videbat
Nati partum inclyti.

MATER DOLOROSA.

Stabat Mater dolorosa,
Juxta crucem lacrymosa
Dum pendebat Filius;
Cujus animam gementem,
Contristatam ac dolentem,
Pertransivit gladius.

O quam tristis et afflicta
Fuit illa benedicta
Mater Unigeniti:
Quae moerebat et dolebat
Et tremebat, cum videbat
Nati poenas inclyti.

And so the close imitation continues throughout, with two exceptions; namely, the 5th and 13th stanzas, which have no counterpart in the *Mater dolorosa*.

I. AUTHORSHIP.

The question immediately arises: Which hymn was composed first? Which was the original, which is the imitation? The competent and learned French scholar, A. F. Ozanam, who was the first to call attention to the *Mater Speciosa*, concluded that both were by the same author, Jacoponus de Benedictis, whose title to the composition of the *Stabat Mater Dolorosa* he seemed to consider unquestioned. The Anglican hymnologist, Dr. J. M. Neale, added to this the supposition that the "Speciosa" preceded the "Dolorosa."

As the first lines of the hymns differ only in the last word, the title "Speciosa" may serve to indicate the hymn under consideration now, while that of "Dolorosa" may be taken to describe the other.

An edition of the Italian poems of Jacopone, published in 1495 at Brescia, contained both hymns in Latin; but so thoroughly had the immense popularity, and withal, very superior merit, of the *Dolorosa* eclipsed the *Speciosa*, that this latter fell into almost complete oblivion, until it was rediscovered by the historian of the Franciscan Poets, A. F. Ozanam, and by him transcribed from a manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris, and printed in his *Les Poètes Franciscains en Italie au Treizième Siècle*, Paris, 1852. Ozanam thought it had never been published before: "Je crois le *Stabat Mater Speciosa* encore inédit" (*Œuvres Complètes*, Vol. V., p. 183). His delight at his discovery may be imagined from his comment on both hymns. Speaking first of the *Dolorosa* he says *inter alia*:

"Cette œuvre incomparable suffirait à la gloire de Jacopone : mais en même temps que le *Stabat* du Calvaire, il avait voulu composer le *Stabat* de la crèche, où paraissait la Vierge mère dans toute la joie de l'enfantement. Il l'écrivit sur les mêmes mesures et sur les mêmes rimes ; tellement qu'on pourrait douter un moment lequel fut le premier, du chant de douleur ou du chant d'allégresse. Cependant, la postérité a fait un choix entre ces deux perles semblables ; et, tandis qu'elle conservait l'une avec amour, elle laissait l'autre enfouie. Je crois le *Stabat Mater speciosa* encore inédit ; et, quand j'essaie d'en traduire quelques strophes, je sens s'échapper l'intraduisible charme de la langue, de la mélodie, et de la naïveté antique" (ib., p. 183). He then gives a prose version of some of the stanzas.

All this occurs in his Essay on Jacopone, and is a clear intimation that he believes both to have been composed *en même temps*, and that the *Speciosa* was modeled upon the *Dolorosa* : Il l'écrivit sur les mêmes mesures et sur les mêmes rimes.

Dr. Neale closed his long and able devotion to Mediæval Hymnology by introducing the *Speciosa*, with a translation, to the English reading public shortly before his death (1866). Neale, like Ozanam, ascribes the poem to Jacopone. Dr. Schaff (*Literature and Poetry*, p. 222) differs from this view : "This is improbable. A poet would hardly write a parody on a poem of his own. That man must be exceedingly vain who would make himself a model for imitation ; and Jacopone was so humble that he forgot himself and went to the extreme of ascetic self-abnegation." The *Speciosa* is not so finished a poem as the *Dolorosa*, and is marred by some imperfect rhyme. Neale therefore concluded that it was an early attempt at Sequence-writing by a man who was beginning to form his hand to an exacting labor. In that case we should have to consider the *Dolorosa* as an imitation of the *Speciosa*—a hypothesis which Schaff cannot accept for a moment. The latter, with all its imperfections on its head, could scarce have served as a model for so flawless a poem as the *Dolorosa*. Besides this, Schaff calls attention to the fact that "the opening of the *Stabat Mater (dolorosa)* was borrowed from the Latin Bible (John xix., 25), with reference to Mary at the Cross, but not at the Cradle. The sixth line, 'pertransivit gladius,' may have suggested 'pertransivit júbilus,' but not *vice versa*. . . . The passion hymn soon became popular and passed into public worship ; but the Christmas hymn had no such good luck. It is the fame of an original which invites imitation." He therefore concludes that "the author of the *Mater Speciosa* belonged probably to the Franciscan Order, but lived and wrote after Jacopone, when the *Mater Dolorosa* was already well known and widely used. This fact best explains also the enlargement and the supernumerary lines of the

eighth stanza. The *Mater Speciosa* wants the last finish, while the *Mater Dolorosa* is perfect. The very reason which Dr. Neale urges for the priority of the former, proves its posteriority."

The opinion of Schaff is echoed by Dr. Coles: "Ingenious and exact as is the parallel, it is easy enough to see which was first and which was second. If twins, the *Mater Dolorosa* must have been the elder. It is impossible that 'Pertransivit jubilus' was written before 'Pertransivit gladius.' But we doubt, we confess, a simultaneous birth, or even a common parentage."

II. COMMENT.

Like many other Latin hymns, these two *Stabats* seem to possess the subtle power of melting the hearts of those who are most averse to veneration of the *Mater*, whether *dolorosa* or *speciosa*. Thus Dr. Coles confesses to both feelings, attraction and aversion: "That the new found *Stabat* is not wanting in those qualities which have attracted to its illustrious prototype the admiring regards of men through so many generations, testifies to the skill of the writer. The structural correspondence between the two is kept up throughout. Grief and anguish are seen to go hand in hand, singing as they go, to the same sweet time and measure. Were it only poetry and not prayer—mere apostrophe and not religious homage—we would be content; but alas! there clings to one and the other the fatal taint of idolatry; and we are not permitted to wink out of sight so unspeakable an offense against the purity of the unshared worship of the infinite Jehovah." More kindly and more gentle is Dr. Schaff: "It is a parallelism of contrast which runs from beginning to end. The *Mater Speciosa* is a Christmas hymn, and sings the overflowing joy of Mary at the cradle of the new-born Saviour. The *Mater Dolorosa* is a Good Friday hymn, and sings the piercing agony of Mary at the cross of her divine human Son. They breathe the same love to Christ, and the burning desire to become identified with Mary by sympathy in the intensity of her joy as in the intensity of her grief. They are the same in structure, and excel alike in the singularly touching music of language, and the soft cadence that echoes the sentiment. Both consist of two parts, the first of which describes the objective situation; the second identifies the author with the situation, and addresses the Virgin as an object of worship. Both bear the impress of their age and the monastic order which probably gave them birth. The mysterious charm and power of the two hymns are due to the subject and to the intensity of feeling with which the author seized it. Mary at the manger, and Mary at the cross, opens a vista to an abyss of joy and of grief such as the world never saw before. Mary stood there not only as the mother, but as

the representative of the whole Christian church, for which the eternal Son of God was born an infant in the manger, and for which He suffered the most ignominious death on the cross."

The great power of both poems probably lies in the fact that the author everywhere makes us see the manger and the cross through the eyes of the Blessed Mother who looked so close upon both. The poems are not merely epics which describe great events; not merely lyrics which voice the ardent emotion of the singer at contemplating the same events; but are at once descriptions and lyric cries—the pictures filling the imagination, the cries filling the heart. And in the intensity of the singer's emotion we are forced to share, drawn as by a spiritual magnet within the magic circle of his own joys and griefs. The Babe lying helpless in the manger, the Man hanging dead upon the cross—these cannot speak to us; but Mary is the living witness at both wondrous places. We can try to enter into her emotions, can smile and weep with her; and by the subtlest workings of sympathy, can be identified with her both at Bethlehem and at Calvary. This identification the author succeeds in effecting, and thence arises, we conceive, the real power and attractiveness of the two hymns. In his "Essay on Minor Rites and Ceremonies," Cardinal Wiseman develops this thought: "Surely," he says, "there is One, who had a share in these and all other such scenes, through whose eyes we should all be glad to view them, in whose heart we should long to feel them. If in the reflection upon another's soul we wish to view the occurrences—joyful, dolorous, or triumphant—through which mercy and glory were purchased for us, there is one 'Mirror of Justice,' bright, spotless, untarnished, which reflects them in their full clearness and truth. Shall we not strive to look upon it? If these events called up feelings in every spectator, in one breast alone they found depth, and breadth, and strength enough to do them full justice. Shall we not watch and study its heavings and powerful throes? The maternal heart alone could contain the ocean of bitterness, or the heaven of joy, which these various mysteries were fitted to create. And hence the natural desire of loving souls to be its associate, and to stand with its venerable possessor in sight of all that She saw, in hearing of all that She heard, in observance of all that She laid up in her heart.

Juxta { stramen }
 { Crucem } tecum stare
 Et me tibi sociare
 In { foeno }
 { planctu } desidero."

Cardinal Wiseman has here seized on the parallelism of contrast in the two hymns—similarity of form and phrase, and complete antithesis of theme and thought. Through the eyes of Mary we are to see Jesus, whether in the manger or on the cross. The joy of one scene and the sorrow of the other are antitheses of theme and thought, unified in the person of the Mother and presented to us in a unique form of stanza.

III. EMENDATIONS.

One would like to think that both *Stabats* were the work of a single pen; and, indeed, if the glaring imperfections of the technique (imperfections which should be credited, perhaps, to the negligence of the scribe to whom is due the manuscript in the Bibliothèque Nationale) were removed by skilful conjecture and emendation, one might concede a common authorship to both poems. Ozanam's MS. is clearly imperfect. For instance, the first line of the third stanza runs:

Quis est qui non gauderet,

which lacks a syllable. The similar line in the *Dolorosa* is:

Quis est homo qui non fleret.

Schaff and Coles insert *jam*:

Quis jam est qui non gauderet.

Johann Kayser amends by adding the suffix *nam*:

Quisnam est qui non gauderet.

The second line of the seventh stanza reads:

Prone introducas plagas.

Ozanam questions *prone* with an added "(sic)," and Kayser amends by writing the line:

Parvi introducas plagas.

The second line of the ninth stanza seems in the MS. to be needlessly unrhythmical:

Ne facias me immunem;

and Kayser corrects by inverting as follows:

Ne me facias immunem.

The fourth line of the tenth stanza gives the most difficulty; and Ozanam adds another "(sic)":

Fac ut portem pulchrum fantem (*sic*),

Qui nascendo vicit mortem,

Volens vitam tradere.

Fantem does not rhyme with mortem; and Schaff suggests:

Fac, ut pulchrum fantem portem,

Qui nascendo vicit mortem,

and is faithfully followed by Coles and the editor of *Seven Great Hymns of the Mediæval Church*.

Koenigsfeld suggests:

Fac ut pulchrum infantem portem,

eliding for the sake of metre just as the poet himself does in his own line:

Fuit illa immaculata.

A much happier emendation, as it seems to us, is that of Kayser:

Fac ut portem pulchrum, fortem

Qui nascendo vicit mortem;

for not only is sense consulted for, but as well a perfect similarity with the appropriate lines of the *Dolorosa* is attained in the effecting of an internal rhyme:

Fac ut portem Christi mortem,

Passionis fac consortem.

The third line of the next stanza is given by Ozanam:

Stans inter tripudia.

Schaff appears to have read Ozanam's line:

Stans inter tripudio,

misled, apparently, by the thought of a rhyme for the *commercio* closing the stanza. He accordingly changes the line into

Stantem in tripudio,

and writes a footnote: "I suggest this as an emendation for the very obvious mistake of the original, as given by Ozanam." Dr. Coles accepts the suggested emendation, and also appends to the page a note: "Since *inter* never rules the ablative, Dr. Schaff proposes to read 'Stantem in tripudio!' referring 'Stantem' to 'me.'"

From all this it seems evident that the text has not been faithfully preserved, and that no very strong argument can be based on its lack of finish to prove that the author of the finished poem *Stabat Mater dolorosa* could scarce have been the author also of the *Stabat Mater speciosa*. Wherever it was possible to amend the text according to the suggested readings just given, we have done so in the comparison columns already included in this paper. But in offering the following translation of the *Speciosa*,² we have thought proper to confront it with the text of Ozanam, with the single exception that three lines found in Cardinal Wiseman's *Essay on Minor Rites*, etc., and not found in Ozanam, are included, but are placed in brackets.

² It has been translated by Neale, Coles, McCarthy and anonymously in the Roman Catholic *Parochial Hymn Book*.

THE TEXT OF OZANAM.

Stabat Mater speciosa,
Juxta foenum gaudiosa,
Dum jacebat parvulus.
Cujus animam gaudentem,
Laetabundam ac ferventem,
Pertransivit júbilus.

O quam laeta et beata
Fuit illa immaculata
Mater unigeniti!
Quae gaudebat, et ridebat,
Exsultabat, cum videbat
Nati partum inclyti.

Quis est qui non gauderet (*sic*)
Christi Matrem si videret
In tanto solatio?
Quis non posset collaetari
Christi Matrem contemplari
Ludentem cum Filio?

Pro peccatis suae gentis,
Christum vidit cum jumentis,
Et algori subditum;
Vidit suum dulcem natum
Vagientem, adoratum
Vili diversorio.

Nato Christo in praesepe,
Coeli cives canunt laete
Cum immenso gaudio.
Stabat senex cum puella,
Non cum verbo nec loquela,
Stupescences cordibus.

Eia Mater, fons amoris,
Me sentire vim ardoris
Fac ut tecum sentiam!
Fac ut ardeat cor meum
In amando Christum Deum
Ut sibi complaceam.

Sancta Mater, istud agas:
Prone (*sic*) introducas plagas
Cordi fixas valide.

TRANSLATION.

Stood the fairest Mother, keeping
Watch and ward o'er Jesus sleeping
On His couch of pillowing straw;
Yet with what delight unbounded
Was her glowing heart surrounded
As her dearest Babe she saw!

Joy she felt, as might no other
Save alone the spotless Mother
Of the Sole-begotten One:
How her swelling breast was telling
The indwelling joys upwelling
As she bent above her Son!

Who can read the wondrous story,
Nor feel something of the glory
Christ's dear Mother felt of old?
Who can picture her caressing
Such a Child, nor feel a blessing
Like to hers, his heart enfold?

For His people's sins, a manger
Held the Saviour as a stranger,
Chilled with worse than wintry air:
Yet the angels bowed before Him,
Magi hastened to adore Him;
Stable 't was—yet Heaven was there.

Christ was born within a stable:
Sing, ye heavenly hosts, unable
To contain your vast amaze:
Yet a deeper joy unspoken
Held the twain in peace unbroken—
Mary, Joseph, silent gaze.

Mother, fount of love o'erflowing,
Let me share with thee the glowing
Ardors of the cherubim;
That my inmost heart, revealing
Nought but love at Love's unsealing,
May be pleasing unto Him.

Holy Mother, let me borrow
Something of thy tender sorrow,
Graven deeply on my heart:

Tui Nati coelo lapsi,
 Jam dignati foeno nasci
 Poenas mecum divide.

Fac me vere congaudere,
 Jesulino cohaerere,
 Donec ego vixero.
 (Juxta stramen tecum stare
 Et me tecum sociare
 In foeno desidero.)

In me sistat ardor tui,
 Puerino fac me frui,
 Dum sum in exilio.
 Hunc ardorem fac communem,
 Ne facias me immunem
 Ab hoc desiderio.

Virgo Virginum praeclara,
 Mihi jam non sis amara :
 Fac me parvum rapere.
 Fac ut portem pulchrum fantem, (*sic*)
 Qui nascendo vicit mortem,
 Volens vitam tradere.

Fac me tecum satiari,
 Nato tuo inebriari,
 Stans inter tripudia.
 Inflammatus et accensus,
 Obstupescit omnis sensus
 Tali de commercio.

Fac me nato custodiri,
 Verbo Dei praemuniri,
 Conservari gratia.
 Quando corpus morietur,
 Fac ut animae donetur
 Tui Nati visio.*

Omnes stabulum amantes,
 Et pastores vigilantes
 Pernoctantes sociant.
 Per virtutem Nati tui,
 Ora ut electi sui
 Ad patriam veniant.

Amen.

* Ici doit finir la prose de Jacopone. Une main étrangère peut-être y ajouta les deux strophes suivantes.

Of the shame the manger offered,
Of the woes the Saviour suffered,
Let me share with thee a part.

Grant a measure of thy pleasure;
Let me hold thy Baby Treasure
Throughout life with love and awe:
Count me no intruding stranger
If with thee, beside His manger,
I bend o'er the scattering straw.

While an exile here I wander,
May my longing soul grow fonder
Of my Infant God and thee;
Closer be the constant union,
Dearer still the sweet communion
With the Holy Family.

Virgin, purer than all others,
Mother, tenderest of mothers,
To mine arms thy Infant give:
Let me bear the precious Burden,
Whose dear birth prepared our guerdon;
For He died that we might live.

Let me taste the raptured sweetness
Of the Babe's divine completeness—
Let me leap with joy divine:
Steep my senses beyond measure
In the ocean depths of pleasure,
Since such fellowship is mine.

May the Word of God forearm me;
Through His love, no evil harm me,
Saved and nourished by His grace:
When in death the veil is riven,
May my soul, caught up to Heaven,
See Him ever face to face.

All who love the stable lowly,
With the shepherds joined, a holy
Vigil keep of faith and love:
Mary, pray we may inherit
Through thy Son's atoning merit,
Endless fatherland above.

H. T. HENRY.

St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook.

THE JESUITS OF L'ANCIEN REGIME WHO LABORED ON MICHIGAN SOIL—THEIR DETRACTORS.

1. The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents. Travels and Explorations of the Jesuit Missionaries in New France; 1610-1791. The Original French, Italian, and Latin Texts; with English translations and notes; illustrated by portraits, maps and fac-similes. Edited by Reuben Gold Twaites, Secretary State Historical Society of Wisconsin; 1902. Cleveland, the Burrows Brothers. Octavo, 71 volumes, each about 300 pages.

2. Collections and Researches made by the Michigan Pioneer and Historical Society. Vol. xxix. Octavo pp. 764. Lansing, Mich., 1901.

3. History of the Catholic missions among the Indian tribes of the United States; 1529-1854; by John Gilmary Shea. 12mo., pp. 506. New York, E. Dunnigan and Brother, 1855.

4. Claude Jean Allouez, S. J., Missionary; by Rev. Joseph Stephen La Boule. Parkman Club publication No. 17. Milwaukee, Wis., 1897.

5. Father James Marquette, S. J. The missionary explorer. By Hon. Thomas A. E. Weadock, Member of Congress from Michigan. U. S. Catholic Historical Society Magazine. Vol. i., 1892.

6. Sketch of Father Louis André, S. J., by Father Arthur E. Jones, S. J., archivist of St. Mary's College, Montreal, Canada. U. S. Catholic Historical Magazine, New York, 1889.

MICHIGAN includes two Peninsulas, known as the Lower and the Upper. The former extends downward from the conjunction of the waters of Lakes Michigan and Huron, known as the Straits of Mackinac, in which mingle those of the Georgian Bay, and the overflow of Lake Superior. Lake Huron receives these waters and discharges them into the River Saint Clair, thence into the lake of that name, which circling around the head of Belle Isle, reunite in the beautiful bay, whence for twenty miles extends *le détroit du Lac Erie*; which latter speeds them on their way to Niagara and the Atlantic.

It was at the head of this Strait that the city, taking its name from the deep and limpid stream, which courses downward, since known as Detroit, was founded in 1701.

When the Territory of Michigan, which comprised only the Lower Peninsula, was seeking statehood in 1836, she claimed that her southern boundary line included what is now the city of Toledo.

The State of Ohio disputed this claim, and her Governor, Lucas, prepared to sustain her pretension. But Michigan, too plucky to submit to the "Buckeye" blusterer, called out her soldiers, which, "horse foot and artillery," were equipped, and under command of her young Governor, Stevens T. Mason, marched to the vicinity of the muddy little burg of Toledo. But President Andrew Jackson had at the time more important matters claiming his attention than the "Toledo war."

Ohio was given Toledo, and Michigan was placated by the gift of the entire Upper Peninsula, known at the time as the "Lake Superior Region," which, when Michigan was admitted to statehood, became part of her domain.

The Lower Peninsula, from her southern boundary line, is entirely surrounded with water. Through the centre of these waterways runs the line which separates the sovereignty of the American from the British.

The northern extremity of the Lower Peninsula is watered by the Straits of Mackinac, which contains the island of that name. It includes Cheboygan, Emmet and Presque Isle counties. Across the Straits is St. Ignace, which may be said to divide the waters of Lakes Huron and Michigan. It is in the county of Michilimacinac where commences the territory of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan.

Lake Superior is reached by the River St. Mary. The approach to this stream, through which flow the surplus waters of the greatest fresh water sea in the world, is through the most charming water region in North America.

It is doubtful if there exists any fresh water bay in America of such an extent as the Georgian Bay. Its atmosphere of freshness is temperate, while its waters are so transparent that at a depth of 30 feet the white pebbles on its bottom are one of its beautiful features; while the finny tribes, as each may be startled by the shadow, are clearly defined, and whose phosphorescent sheen, as they dart to and fro, startle the beholder from the steamer's deck, as this paradise of Michigan's water region is traversed. This is the approach to the chilly and sterile region of Lake Superior, comprising the Upper Peninsula of the State of Michigan. It has memories of historic interest connecting with the establishing of Christianity in this part of Michigan, 260 years ago.

In 1641 the Jesuit missionary fathers, Isaac Jogues and Charles Raymbaut, who had served in Huronia, zealous to propagate Christianity among the Indian nations of Northwestern Michigan as now constituted, crossed in their bark canoe the romantic Georgian Bay and ascended the stream flowing from the North into its waters and leading to Lake Superior, which they named in honor of the mother of our Saviour, St. Mary. The *Sault Ste. Marie*, "Leap of the St. Mary," as named by the Jesuits, Fathers Jogues and Raymbaut, is a historic locality in American Catholic annals. The standard of the Cross was raised here and the Chippewas baptized by these Jesuit missionaries, before Eliot had begun to preach to the unfortunate Massachusetts tribes at Nonatum.

The river at the Sault is about a mile and a quarter wide, and the rapids or cataract, whose bottom is formed by huge boulders, over which the overflow of the waters of the great fresh water sea, Lake Superior, leap and rush madly down to the level below, roaring and foaming for three-quarters of a mile, through a breadth of over 1,000 feet, creating an atmosphere of freshness which can be compared

only to that of Niagara, where these same waters take their grandest leap on their way to the Atlantic.¹

The scene is a wild one, while its natural features have changed but little, since the two missionary fathers gazed in wonder at the raging waters. But its surroundings at the present day are bewildering to the student of less than half a century ago. A system of lockage, the finest and most extensive in the world, with a double capacity, has been built by the American Government, under the supervision of General Orlando M. Poe, U. S. Topographical Engineers, on the American side, which permits the passage from the lower lakes into Lake Superior, and vice versa, of the largest freight steamers known in modern times, with cargoes of coal, etc., going up, and cargoes of flour, cereals, ore, metals, etc., going down. A similar system of lockage has been built on the Canadian side; while the most gigantic water power system known on the American continent is in progress. An international bridge spans the rapids over which extensive trains run constantly. The arrivals and clearances and aggregate annual tonnage exceed that of any commercial port in the world, while the value of the product carried is enormous.

But the Chippewas and other tribes have gradually disappeared, and with them the population of half-breeds of French and Indian stock. Fathers Jogues and Raymbaut, hoping to return and evangelize the Chippewas, departed for Canada. The careers of both these holy missionaries were prematurely ended.²

After an interval of nearly twenty years the veteran of the Iroquoian missions, René Menard, opened the first regular mission on the soil of Michigan at Keweenaw Bay in 1660.

There is something sublime and grand, writes Dr. Shea, in the heroism of these early missionaries. Menard went destitute and alone, broken with age and toil. His head was whitened with years, his face scarred with wounds received in the streets of Cayuga, for he had been one of the first to bear the faith into Central New York. Thoroughly inured to Indian life, with a knowledge of many Huron and Algonquin dialects, René Menard sought to conclude his life's labors among the Ottawas of Michigan. His journey from Montreal with the fleet of returning Ottawa canoes to the waters of Lake Superior was a long drawn *Via Crucis*, while its narration is painful to read. The brutal Ottawa chiefs, who made the venerable man of

¹ "The Chippewas of Lake Superior," by R. R. Elliott, *AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW*, Vol. xxi., No. 82. April, 1896.

² Father Jogues was a native of Orleans, France; born in January, 1607. His family was respectable and still exists in his native city. He became a Jesuit in 1636, proceeded to Quebec, thence to Huronia. His missionary career abounds in atrocious cruelty and ends in death from an Iroquoian tomahawk, 1646. Father Raymbaut succumbed to climatic fever.

God toil without food or rest, paid no regard to his silvered head or to his wasted frame.

But he finally reached Keweenaw, which was his "first station" in missionary work on Michigan soil; where, like his brethren in other fields of apostolic work, he sought out, reaffirmed in the faith, encouraged and consoled such Christian families as were domiciled in the Keweenaw district. His own account of his apostolate is discouraging and sad to read. But where this venerable soldier of the cross rendered up his soul to God, whether he died by violence or by starvation, is one of the unsolved problems in the missionary history of Michigan.

Succeeding Father René Menard was the venerable Father Gabriel Druillettes, who labored at or near Sault Ste. Marie till 1699, when he returned to Quebec and died there in April, 1681, at the age of 88. He was, quotes Dr. Shea, a man of 50 when he came; he suffered more than most of his companions, while his extreme zeal for the conversion of souls and the great talent God had given him for languages made him one of our best missionaries.

Charlevoix, after relating one of the miracles ascribed to him, says that God had rendered him powerful in word and work.³

Another celebrated Jesuit missionary who labored on Michigan soil was Father Claude Dablon, who had accompanied Father Druillettes on an expedition overland to Hudson's Bay, who was next with Father Marquette on Lake Superior in 1668, and who after founding the mission of Sault Ste. Marie, became superior of all the missions in 1670.

In chronological order we now take up one of the most illustrious of the fathers of the Society of Jesus, of *l'ancien régime*, who labored on the soil of Michigan, James Marquette. In the sketch of the life of this distinguished missionary by Hon. Thomas Addis Emmet Weadock, M. C. from Michigan, which was read before the United States Catholic Historical Society of New York, and which has been printed in the annals of this society, he writes:

His story is particularly interesting to the people of Michigan because: He established the first permanent settlement begun by Europeans in this state, Sault Ste. Marie, in 1668. He was the first white man that trod the soil of the Island of Mackinac or the territory which is now known as the State of Iowa.

He erected the first cabin and said the first Mass in Chicago, and said the first Mass in what is now the State of Illinois. He discovered the tidal rise and fall in Lake Michigan 150 years before it was noticed by another, and last, and greatest of all in a historical sense,

³ Shea's "French Missions," p. 141.

he discovered the Father of Waters, the Mississippi. The city of Laon, capital of Picardy, was the birthplace of James Marquette, in the year 1637. His family was among the first of the *bourgeois* class in his native city; while in the century succeeding, three of his name and kindred fought and bled for American Independence, under Lafayette.

His mother, who was a La Salle, inculcated in his youthful mind that deep reverence for the Mother of God, which was always a feature in his religious life. At the age of 17 he joined the Society of Jesus; after the usual fourteen years' probation he was ordained to the priesthood. In 1666 he sailed for Canada and arrived at Quebec September 20 of the same year.

His vocation was that of a missionary, awaiting the order of the superior of the Jesuits at Quebec. He was in the prime of life, 31 years old.

After two years' study of the Indian dialects at the College of Quebec he was directed to prepare for the Ottawa mission in the far distant west. He had acquired a fair knowledge of the dialects of the Upper Lake Indian tribes.

Father Marquette was sent to Sault Ste. Marie, where in 1668 he founded the first permanent European settlement in Michigan, which was located where the city of that name now stands. In the following year he was joined by Father Claude Dablon, S. J. There were, it is stated, about 2,000 Indians of the Algonquin tribes in the vicinity, but this number may have been an exaggerated estimate.

They were well disposed towards Christianity, but the missionaries used extreme caution in administering the Sacrament of Baptism. The chapel erected was dedicated to the Blessed Virgin, as the rapids and the river had been given the name of the Mother of God by their brethren, Fathers Jogues and Raymbaut, the former of whom had, as stated, met a martyr's death at the hands of the Mohawks, while the latter had been called to his eternal reward.

From Sault Ste. Marie Father Marquette was transferred to Chegoimegon, subsequently known as La Pointe du St. Esprit, which he reached after a month's journey, attended by dangers and hardships. He arrived in 1669. War was provoked two years later between the Hurons and the Ottawas, and the powerful and warlike nation of the Sioux. As a result, the two former nations, accompanied by Father Marquette, were forced to leave Chegoimegon.

A settlement was made at Point St. Ignace, where a chapel was built. This locality was on the coast at a point subsequently known as Michilimacinac and was the centre of Catholic Indian missionary work as long as New France was under French control. It must not be confounded with the Island of Mackinac, peopled by some of the Ottawas, which, after the British conquest, was fortified and

garrisoned. But St. Ignace, which as Father Marquette writes was the central point between the three great lakes, was a bleak and cold locality. In winter the cold was intense, while the winds, now from Lake Huron, then from Lake Michigan, and worse than all, from Lake Superior, made the climate at times intensely cold. The cultivation of the soil was attended with poor results. But the finest fresh water fish in the world abounded, while at certain seasons of the year game was available.

In 1672 Father Marquette reported to the Father Superior at Quebec the prosperous state of his mission and expressed his readiness to leave and seek unknown nations to the South. The assurance was brought him that he was to go as a missionary to explore the Mississippi. Joliet, the royal hydrographer, was sent by the Intendant Talon as a scientific companion of the missionary. He arrived at St. Ignace on the Feast of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, auspiciously, too, because Father Marquette had invoked her aid to obtain from God the favor of being able to visit the nations on the Mississippi.

Preparations for the voyage were completed during the winter. Toward the latter part of May, 1673, Father Marquette and M. Joliet, with two bark canoes, five Indians and a supply of provisions, left St. Ignace, and began their journey, according to their plans, which had been outlined and mapped, to discover and explore the great river of the South the missionary had set his heart upon reaching.

It does not fall within the purpose of this study to detail missionary work outside the boundaries of Michigan. The history of the discovery and exploration of the Mississippi, by Father Marquette, has been faithfully related by the accomplished and painstaking Mr. Weadock. For all that he has proposed he quotes acknowledged historical gospel.

We shall therefore attempt to outline the melancholy ending of the career of Father Marquette, which occurred on Michigan soil after his return from his Mississippi voyage. He wished to die at Michilimacinae among his brethren with the rites of the Holy Church, so he set out on his return voyage via St. Joseph's river and the eastern shore of Lake Michigan. His strength gradually failed, but he calmly contemplated the end with Christian fervency.

It was given to Father Marquette to die on Michigan soil. It imports but little under what circumstances, or precisely where his young life was ended. His mortal remains were in time discovered by Father Gabriel Richard of Detroit, and the place marked. But these particulars, comparatively speaking, are of small import; the glorious renown of the missionary is a part of American history. Here in Detroit, a statue of the missionary and explorer adorns the

façade of the City Hall, placed there by one of the purest minded gentlemen who had not had the blessing of living in the Catholic faith, but who was attracted by that magic which binds men of genius to each other, regardless of race or creed, to pay this tribute to Marquette.⁴

So, also, another statue, by a celebrated artist, has been placed in the Capitol at Washington. It commemorates the memory of a priest, missionary and explorer, which the people of the States of the giant West decided to have placed there, but which the small souled pygmies whose narrow minds reject the freedom of religion, opposed under one pretext or another, until it happily fell to Mr. Weadock, to whose memoir we have been so much indebted for what we have written of Marquette, to have the wishes of the people of the West gratified. There is another monument to the young missionary and explorer, quite significantly placed, in a locality equally suggestive; this is in the city of Marquette, queen city of the Lake Superior region of Michigan, where by the efforts of a noble hearted gentleman, Peter White, whom, much to our regret, we admit, is not of our own faith, a replica of Trentanov's statue at the Capitol at Washington has been erected in that city on the shores of Lake Superior, which perpetuates his name among the people of the State, where his young life was ended.

In 1676 Father Peter A. Bonneault and Henry A. Nouvel, S. J., labored at Sault Ste. Marie, while Father Philip Pierson, S. J., had succeeded Father Marquette in the care of the Christian Hurons at Michilimacinac.

Claude Jean Allouez, S. J., "The Apostle of the Ottawas and the builder of the first Indian missions in Wisconsin," as his most recent biographer, Rev. Joseph Stephen La Boule, Professor in the Provincial Seminary of St. Francis de Sales, Milwaukee, designates him, was among the early Jesuit missionary Fathers who traversed the soil of Michigan.

His labors, however, were more identified with the neighboring State of Wisconsin, but more particularly with that portion whose soil is bordered by the waters of Lake Superior. Father La Boule writes:

"I deem it a pleasure and a duty to my native State to survey the life of this remarkable man, and to trace, even though it be with unskilled eye, 'the footprints he has left behind him in the sands of time.'"⁵

Father Allouez was born in St. Didier near Lyons, apparently in June, 1622. His collegiate course is described by his biographer

⁴ The late Bela Hubbard.

⁵ Parkman Club Publications, No. 17. Milwaukee, Wis., June 8, 1897.

and his successful examination at Puy, after which he prepared himself to become a priest, a Jesuit and a missionary.

At the age of 17 he was received a member of the Society of Jesus and after the usual probationary term of fourteen years he was ordained to the priesthood and assigned to duty in the Jesuit church of Rhodéz, France. But his soul moved him to a more heroic career, and he sought to develop it in missionary work in New France. Father Rocette, S. J., his superior at Toulouse, wrote him March 3, 1657, with permission to go to Canada and to join his brother Jesuits engaged in missionary work among the Indians. His qualities are thus noted: "He is possessed of a vigorous constitution, of a fine mind and disposition, of good judgment and great prudence. He is firm in purpose, proficient in literature and theology and eminently fitted for missionary work."⁶

Here, then, writes his biographer, is a Frenchman of the mountainous Loire country type; a man of middle stature, of vigorous frame, yet graceful deportment; a man who is inured to exposure and toil, as he is trained in the science of spiritual perfection; capable of living contented in the huts of barbarians as well as moving with due tact in salons of refined French society.

Such a man it is whom we presently see embarking on a project which, as Bancroft says, "has imperishably connected his name with the progress of discovery in the West," and which made him the apostle of the Upper Lake Indians.⁷

Father Allouez was invited to sail with M. D'Argenson, who had recently been appointed Governor of New France. Two lay brothers joined the party, and after a long and stormy voyage Quebec was reached July 11, 1658. He soon after commenced a preparatory course of the study of the Upper Lake Indian dialects. While awaiting at the College of Quebec a favorable opportunity to reach the Ottawa mission, intelligence was received of the death of two distinguished Indian missionaries; first of Father Leonard Garreau, who met a terrible fate; second of Father Menard, his dear friend, to whom he had bade farewell on his departure from Three Rivers for the Lake Superior country in 1660.

In May, 1665, Father Allouez left the college to meet the Ottawa Indians who annually came from the Upper Lakes to trade at Three Rivers. He was disappointed; he found them uncouth and brutal "beyond description." But this was not the worst, they were unfriendly.

It was not without difficulty that he obtained an equivocal per-

⁶ Father La Boule quotes from the Jesuit archives of France, and also *in re*, Dr. Shea's opinion.

⁷ Parkman Club Publications, No. 17, p. 185.

mission for himself and party, six in all, to accompany the Ottawas on their return journey to Michilimacinac, and then they were separated among 400 Indians. The route taken at that time for such parties was up the Ottawa River and by way of Lake Nipissing with portages to the Georgian Bay, and thence to Lake Huron. It was a journey of 500 or 600 miles from Three Rivers, with many portages, across which had to be carried the canoes and effects of the travelers. It is difficult to describe the cruel treatment experienced at the hands of these brutal Indians during this long and tedious journey lasting over two months, by this devoted missionary; starvation, overwork, and finally abandonment after his canoe had been disabled, on a desolate shore. But Father Allouez had great faith in the Divine mercy; he survived the ordeal and won the admiration of the Ottawa chiefs.

The flotilla finally arrived at Sault Ste. Marie, but did not tarry there, although the missionary would have been much gratified to have visited with the few Frenchmen then domiciled at the *Sault*.

The fleet of canoes were carried over the portage and launched into the waters of the great lake, coasting along the south shore.

It was great enjoyment for Father Allouez during all the rest of that month to witness the ever changing and wild scenery of the coast of Lake Superior.

He rested at Keweenaw Bay where Menard had preached to the Ottawa Indians. Here were found two Christian Huron women, whom he says shone like brilliant stars in this darkness of paganism. No doubt, adds his biographer, he also said Mass at this spot consecrated by his saintly brother missionary.

On he went, still westward. He was now on what was to white men territory comparatively unexplored. His tone of correspondence becomes that of a keen observer.

Game and fish are more abundant, and the quality, he tells us, is excellent. His attention is called to the presence of copper mines by the color of the water and the frequent discovery of copper in pieces of ten and twenty pounds on the shores.

The Indians, continues his biographer, seemed to have improved their treatment of Father Allouez, which was now much better. A box in which he had put a number of devotional and other articles and which his Indian companions had stolen from him, was now restored to him.

Henceforth the missionary and his effects were regarded as "manitous," dangerous to touch. His mind became more cheerful and he continues to describe the scenes about him on "the lake that is so stormy and yet so beautiful and so rich in delicious fish and shining metal," that he did not wonder the Indians worshiped it as a divinity and offered it sacrifice.

The Indian fleet had now traversed a distance which Father La Boule estimated at 1,250 miles from Three Rivers, in their bark canoes, and were approaching their destination. They were greatly elated when in the distance they perceived a tongue of land jutting out into the stormy bay at the southwestern end of the lake.

It was the sandspit so familiar to the Lake Superior Indians famed in their early myths and later history as Chéquamégon Point.

Father Allouez, continues his biographer, landed with the flotilla at the head of Chéquamégon Bay October 1, 1665.

Subsequently he located his mission, which he dedicated to the Holy Ghost, contiguous to the villages of the Huron and of the Ottawa nations; the location, in modern days, without wasting time in tracing its exact locality, may be said to be tributary to what is familiarly known as La Pointe, in the head waters of Lake Superior, or as described in the early annals Fond du Lac.

A chapel of bark and a "mission house" of the same material, of modest proportions, were soon constructed for Father Allouez.

Then, after fervent appeals for heavenly assistance, he commenced his apostolic work. Like his saintly brethren in the cantons of the Iroquoian Confederacy, at a corresponding period, he found among the expatriated Hurons many Christian families, whose faith he revived; whose marriages he validated; and whose children he baptized. This experience was vouchsafed to the holy missionary, in consolation for the drastic and crucial incidents of the journey of over 1,200 miles, in which he had been made to endure more than an ordinary white man's share, between Three Rivers and the head waters of Lake Superior. Soon, his biographer states, he taught the playful, tawny little girls and the future Indian braves to raise their hands to Heaven and to chant in melancholy but sweet tones the Pater and the Ave.

From morning dawn to sunset the braves and the squaws, in great number, came to visit the "black robe" to be taught by him how to pray to the "Great Father." The example of the children soon had its effect upon the older Indians.

The laxity of morals so common even among the children was now relieved by most edifying examples of purity; one of which Father Allouez mentions in his *relations*.

Similar evidence of remarkable virtue in this connection is given in the diary of the missionary and are on record.

Besides the little children baptized on New Year's day, 1666, whom the mothers brought to the missionary as "a gift to the little Jesus," he baptized more than 400 infants and adults of the Huron tribes, during his stay at the Bay.

The Hurons were among the elite of the Indian nations of North

America. They had been foremost during the seventeenth century in accepting Christianity. But their nation had been wiped out of existence in Huronia, by their hereditary foes, the warriors of the Iroquoian Confederacy; while their national autonomy for the time being was destroyed.

Many prisoners, men, women and children, had been brought from Huronia to the Iroquoian cantons, where mothers mourned for sons, the flower of the youth of the Five Nations.

The captives were adopted into the communities of the respective tribes. This new blood was much needed in the desolate families of the Iroquoian mothers.

But this new blood was Christian, and thus was Christianity planted in the nations of the League, from the Mohawk to the shores of Lake Erie. We have here related, another example of the tenacity of the faith planted in the hearts of the people of Huronia by the martyred brethren of Father Allouez.

But this was mild work for this zealous apostle. Contiguous to the locality of the Hurons was the Pagan Ottawa canton, whose people Father Allouez determined to convert. He erected a birch bark chapel and mission house in the midst of their cabins. It was a bold, a heroic enterprise, inspired by confidence in the support of the Almighty Power.

His biographer precludes his experience by saying that the status of affairs found in the Ottawa village must have brought to his mind a picture of pandemonium. This he must have expected. But, in the description of no other Indian village, does Father Allouez employ terms so expressive of abhorrence as he does in describing the moral condition of the Ottawas at Chequamegon Bay. The people recognized no sovereign master of Heaven and Earth; they worshiped the sun, the moon, the lakes and rivers, wild beasts, the elements, and demons.

Father Allouez calls their canton a Babylon of libertinism and abomination.

These people, the missionary states, are very little disposed to receive the faith; because they are, more than all others addicted to idolatry, polygamy, laxity of the marriage tie, and to general licentiousness which makes them cast aside all natural decorum. These were the first impressions conceived by the pure soul of Father Allouez. His later experience was more hopeful. Of the Pottawatamies, the Outagamies and the Illinois tribes who came during the fishing season, he speaks more favorably:

Great quantities of whitefish, trout and herring are caught here. The season begins in November and continues after the ice has been formed. Speaking of the Pottawatamies, Father Allouez says

"they are the most docile to our Frenchmen and promising candidates for Christianity, their women are more modest than those of other Indian nations, while the men are kindly mannered.

Father Allouez failed to make any progress among the Ottawas. Convinced that one missionary would be inadequate to combat so much opposition to Christianity he turned his face homeward. But before commencing his return journey, he courageously started for Lake Nepigon. This involved a journey going and coming of more than 1,200 miles. But this great labor was well rewarded. He was received by the Nipissings with open arms. He revived their faith and restored the religious status of their family life.

He remarks: "The fervent devotion of this people gave me sweet consolation and compensated abundantly for past hardships."

The field, writes his biographer, had become too great for one missionary. Help was needed. In 1667 Father Allouez returned to Quebec, where he arrived during the first days of August. The purpose of his visit was to urge the establishment of permanent missions at Chequamegon and tributary territory; to get assistance and requisites for mission chapels. He would take no rest after his long journey and in a few days was ready to return with the Indian flotilla.

Father Louis Nicolas, S. J., and one *donné* volunteered to return with him, as also several French mechanics.

But the Indians refused to take the latter, with the missionary party. All the equipments for his chapels had to be left behind. Father Allouez returned to the scene of his missionary labors, where his biographer states he remained some years. Father Louis Nicolas, S. J., is described in the Relations as "a strong, practical, 'every-day' man and a tireless worker."

His progress was unsatisfactory and he became despondent. One day, it is stated, he told the Ottawas he was going to Sault Ste. Marie. They would not consent to this, admitted their past indifference and promised to amend their lives, and in fact made a serious effort to abolish polygamy, idolatry and superstition. In time many became fervent Christians.

Father Allouez returned to Sault Ste. Marie in 1669, and Father James Marquette took his place at Chequamegon Bay.

Dr. Shea says: Father Allouez was a fearless and devoted missionary; as a man of zeal and piety he is not inferior to any of his day; and his name is imperishably connected with the progress of discovery in the West.⁸

This is a very high tribute; for the days of Father Allouez were those of scholarly and scientific men; numbering saints, martyrs,

⁸ History of the Catholic Missions Among the Indian Tribes of the United States, etc., by Dr. John Gilmary Shea. P. 413.

explorers and heroes; such indeed were his contemporaries, his brethren of *l'ancien régime* of the Society of Jesus in North America. After thirteen years more of missionary work in Western fields the heroic career of this saintly man was ended.

Associated with him at times on Michigan soil was Father Louis André, S. J., of whom Father Arthur Jones, S. J., of St. Mary's College, Montreal, writes:

Father Louis André was born in 1623, and previous to his coming to New France he had entered the Society of Jesus as a member of the Province of Toulouse. As a Canadian missionary he was within the jurisdiction of the province of France. Father André reached Quebec on the 7th of June, 1669.

But a short time elapsed before he was sent to the Western Missions, where Claude Allouez, James Marquette, Claude Dablon, together with the coadjutor Brother Louis Le Boesme, were already toiling in the Master's vineyard. André's year of apprenticeship to a missionary life was made probably in part at St. Ignace, Michilimacinac and at the Baie des Puants.

The winter was probably passed at the former. Fathers André and Druillettes were at Sault Ste. Marie in the spring of 1670. To enable the reader, writes Father Jones, to form an adequate idea of the hardships endured by Father André, and to obtain a graphic account of his apostolic labors, the Jesuit Relations themselves should be consulted, as therein the facts are given, often in his own words.

In 1671 Father André was again at Michilimacinac; from this year until 1681 he worked during all seasons for the conversion of the Western nations. In 1682 he rested from his continuous labors at Michilimacinac, but only for a year. The following year he was again on his missionary tours.

He was a successful missionary wherever he worked. This was his last year's work in the Western Missions. He was now in his sixtieth year. The Father Superior at Quebec deemed advisable to give him a permanent rest and he was accordingly recalled to Quebec. He was named professor of philosophy in the Jesuits' College, and performed other literary work until 1690; in the meantime he had compiled his Algonquin and Ottawa dictionary, and had written other philological treatises. But this literary work did not satisfy the nature or the ambition of Father André. He was a passionate hunter for human souls.

No sportsman in the pursuit of the wild game of the forest was so ardent as he was to convert from Paganism an Indian and to regenerate his soul with the Sacraments of the Church. He laid aside his literary labors and with the crucifix in hand labored among

the Indian tribes in what is now the Province of Quebec, and with great success.

It was not, however, until 1715 that he was called to his eternal reward at the age of 92. The following circular, continues Father Jones, was sent by his superior, as was the custom on these occasions, to the other houses of the Order. It is the first time it is published :

Quebec, 1 November, 1715.

Reverend Father, Pax Christi:

We have recently lost, in the person of Father Louis André, a missionary laborer loaded down even more with the weight of merit than of years. It is now over forty-five years since he devoted himself to the conversion of the Indians, and it may be justly said of him that in so painful and laborious a vocation he accomplished all the duties of an excellent missionary. There is no doubt but that it was with natural repugnance he adopted the Indian mode of life, and that he underwent many hardships in the long and weary journeyings in which he accompanied his Indians.

These ever disheartened him, for he reckoned fatigue as nought when there was a question of God's glory or the salvation of souls. He labored on the mission until he had attained nearly his eightieth year, and if at any moment of his life he was called upon to do violence to himself in the practice of obedience, it was when his superiors, moved at the sight of his many infirmities and the sufferings inseparable from missionary labor, he must needs have endured at so advanced an age, put a stop to his departure and retained him at Quebec. . . . Already from far back in life, he had prepared himself for death.

It was on the 19th of September last, well on to 4 in the morning, that he went, as we have every reason to believe, fortified by the sacraments of the Church, to receive his eternal reward. You will accord him, Reverend Father, the usual suffrages of the Society, and for myself I beg a share in your Holy Sacrifices, in union with which I am with profound respect, Reverend Father, your Reverence's most humble and obedient servant,

JOSEPH GERMAIN, S. J.

Note by Father Jones. Translated from the copy of the original manuscripts preserved in the Archives of the "Gesu" at Rome.

The learned biographer concludes his memoirs as follows :

The name of Father André, though he had toiled so long in evangelizing the Indians, is not one familiar even to the admirers of the early Jesuit missionaries. If these disjointed notes succeed in drawing the attention of the student of our early history to so meritorious a career, it will amply repay the trouble and research required to bring them together, meagre though they be.

They will at least serve as pointers to his future biographers, who will find in the correct references to the early Relations, given, an easy means of filling outish pages with a thousand interesting details I have omitted, but which are on record as illustrations of the life of this remarkable missionary of the West.⁹

St. Mary's College, Montreal, 27th April, 1889.

Father Philip Pierson succeeded Father Marquette in the control of the two missions at Michilimacinac, where he is credited with building a new chapel in 1674.

Other missionaries laboring at the same locality were in succession: Fathers Charles Albanel and Claude Aveneau.

A few years later we find the names of Fathers Bailloquet and Nouvel. These were subsequently succeeded by Fathers James J. Marest, and the veteran Iroquoian Missionary, Father Stephen de Carheil, who at the close of the seventeenth century were in charge of the missions at Michilimacinac.

⁹ Sketch of Father Louis André, S. J. By Rev. A. E. Jones, S. J. U. S. Catholic Historical Magazine, No. 9.

This locality during the last decade of this same century had become a trading post of such importance that the government of New France maintained a small garrison under charge of a commandant and it was dignified with the name of post.

Its locality was such that trading expeditions on the way to or from Montreal, Three Rivers or Quebec, going or coming by the route via the Ottawa River, etc., tarried at Michilimacinac. The Ottawas domiciled in the vicinity, particularly on the island of Mackinac, were successful hunters; they usually returned from their periodical expeditions to their hunting fields with valuable packs of furs, which, annually, earlier in the century, they had carried for sale and barter to Three Rivers; their flotillas of bark canoes were of considerable extent, the Indians numbering occasionally as many as 400.

Gradually, however, the number of French traders annually coming to Michilimacinac had increased to such an extent that the Indians found it no longer necessary to make the long and toilsome journey to the St. Lawrence; they found a home market at Michilimacinac; this was before the garrisons and Commandants were sent to this locality. Before the advent of the latter the missionaries controlled the Indians and had maintained stringent rules excluding the traffic *eau de vie* among the Ottawas. Moreover, Christianity had been fairly well established, while morality and sobriety prevailed. There was peace and happiness in the Indian cabins. When, however, the commandants and soldiers came to the post from Canada, a great change succeeded; both officers and men became traders. Heretofore Michilimacinac had been the locality of missionary centres, over whose people the missionary fathers exercised a paternal control. Outside of the Indian population the commandants had properly controlled the soldiers and employees of the post.

But the Commandant, his officers, his soldiers and his employees had become traders with the Indians; the principal article of their traffic was *eau de vie*, dealt in at first, *sub rosa*, but later on openly and in *cabarets*.

The protests of the missionaries were without result; for Governor General Frontenac's ear was closed to any Jesuit's appeal.

Finally the Jesuits appealed to the Court of France, and with success. The traffic in *eau de vie* at Michilimacinac was suppressed.

But the mischief it had wrought to the bodies and souls of the Indians of the respective missions may be estimated in part only by the following letter from Father Stephen de Carheil, himself of noble blood, a veteran of the Iroquoian missions, and one of the holiest of the Jesuit priests who had devoted their lives to the conversion to

Christianity of the Indians of North America. At the time this letter was written Father de Carheil was superior of the missions centering at Michilimacinac, it was an exposé of affairs which was addressed to de Callières, Governor General of New France :

At Michilimacinac, the 30th August, 1902.

Monseigneur: Could I have believed that my going down below would have been of any greater use to you than have been all the letters that I have written to you continually, during fifteen entire years—for the purpose of informing you exactly, as in God's sight, according to truth, according to my conscience, of all that was absolutely necessary for the advancement of our missions and for the welfare of the Colony—I would not have failed to go down; and I would have made it my duty to go to explain to you verbally what I might not have sufficiently made known in my letters.

But as I have omitted nothing that I considered myself obliged to let you know, and as I do not see what could have been added to so many letters, I am fully convinced, that my going down could only have been useless to you, after all the information that has been conveyed to you respecting the condition in which we have been up to the present, and in which we still are to-day.

But even if I had never written to you, it was only necessary to have seen all that is to be seen every day at Montreal, and that you yourself have only too often seen, to enable you to carry back to France enough to give information to his majesty, and to constrain him to succor our missions. These are reduced to such an extremity that we can no longer maintain them against an infinite multitude of evil acts—acts of brutality and violence; of injustice and impiety; of lewd and shameless conduct; of contempt and insults. To such acts the infamous and baleful trade in *eau de vie* gives rise everywhere among all the nations up here—where it is carried on by going from village to village, and by roving over the lakes with a prodigious quantity of *eau de vie* in casks without any restraint. Had his majesty but once seen what passes here while this wretched traffic goes on, I am sure he would not for a moment hesitate at the very first sight of it, to forbid it forever under the severest penalties.

In our despair there is no other step to take than to leave our missions and abandon them to the traders in *eau de vie*, so they may establish therein the domain of their traffic, of drunkenness and of immorality.

That is what we shall propose to our superiors in Canada and in France, being compelled thereto by the state of uselessness and inability to which we have been reduced by the permission given to carry on that deplorable traffic—a permission that has been obtained from his majesty only by means of a pretext apparently reasonable, but known to be false; a permission that he would not grant if they whom he relies for ascertaining the truth really made it known to him as they themselves, and the whole of Canada with them, know it; a permission, in fine, that is at once the climax and the source of all the evils that are now occurring.

Especially does it cause the wrecks, of which we never heard before it was given, but which we now hear of as occurring almost every year—while the ships are either coming from or returning to France.

This results from a just punishment by God, who causes the destruction by water of what had been wickedly gained by *eau de vie*; and these wrecks should have prevented its transportation in order to avoid the evil use that would be made of it.

If that permission be not revoked by a prohibition to the contrary, we no longer have occasion to remain in any of our missions in this upper region, to waste the remainder of our lives and all our efforts in purely useless labor, under the domination of continual drunkenness and of universal immorality—which are no less permitted to the traders in *eau de vie* than is the trade itself, of which they are both the accompaniment of the sequel.

If his majesty desires to save our missions and to support the establishment of religion, as we have no doubt he does, we beg him most humbly to believe what is true, namely: there is no other means of doing so than to abolish completely the two infamous sorts of commerce which have brought the missions to the brink of destruction, and which will not long delay in destroying these if they be not abolished as soon as possible by his orders, and being prevented from ever being restored. The first is the traffic in *eau de vie*; the second is the debauchment of the Indian women by the French. Both are carried on in an equally public manner, to the disgrace of the French name, without our being able to remedy the evil, because we missionaries are not supported by the commandants of this post. They, far from attempting, when we venture to remonstrate with them against the continuance of these evils, to restrain their excesses, themselves carry them on with greater freedom than do their subordinates; and so sanction them by their example, that, on witnessing it, a general permission and an assurance of impunity

are assured, that canse them to become so to all the French who come here to trade. So much is this the case that all the villages of our Indians have become drinking centres as regards drunkenness, and Sodoms as regards immorality—from which we missionaries must withdraw, and abandon to the just wrath and vengeance of God.

You will see hy this that, in whatever manner French traffic is established among our Indians in these missions, if it be desired to retain us among them, and to support us in their villages in the capacity of missionaries, in the free exercise of our sacred functions, with the hope of obtaining salutary results, we must be delivered from the control of the commandants, and the pernicious influence of their garrisons. The latter, far from being necessary, are the most immoral element which mitigate against the work of our missionaries; for they serve by the demoralization they cause, to injure both the ordinary trade of the voyageur as well as religious observance. Since the military element has been established here, although it is hy no means extensive, it has been a potent as well as a scandalous factor in the demoralization of the women of the Indian tribes living on the soil.

All the pretended service which the commandants profess to render to the king is reduced to four chief occupations, of which we earnestly beg you to inform his Majesty. The first consists in the traffic in *eau de vie* to the Indians, in their respective villages; who thereby drink to excess, to the ruin of their bodies and souls, and consequent misery in their respective families, notwithstanding all our efforts to prevent the evil, or to mitigate its destructive consequences. For this we are accused of opposing the King's service hy opposing a traffic that he has permitted.

The second is, the selling of *eau de vie* and Indian goods to the soldiers of the garrison, and allowing them to go to the respective villages, where, in fact, they become the factors of the commandants who take no account of their misconduct and wink at their excesses.

The third occupation, consists in making of the fort, a place that I am ashamed to call by its proper name, where the Indian women have found out that their bodies might serve in lieu of heavier skins—and more acceptable than the latter; which demoralizing commerce is continual and extensive.

Whatever efforts the missionaries may make to denounce and abolish it, it continually increases. Besides, the soldiers living outside the forts keep open house, where Indian women pass entire days and nights.

The fourth occupation of the soldiers is gambling. During the season when the Indian traders assemble at the post, this evil becomes excessive. It takes the shape of a continual round of excessive drinking, of gaming and of quarreling. These scandalous excesses have a demoralizing effect upon the Indian population, who are scandalized, but who see that the missionaries are powerless to prevent or to remedy the evil.

Such, your Excellency, are the four principal occupations of the commandants and their garrisons, which have been notorious during many years. If occupations of this kind can be called the King's service. But I have observed none other.

There is no necessity for keeping garrisons here and after they are recalled there is really no necessity for sending others in their place. However, as the pretended need of garrisons is the sole pretext why they continue to be maintained here, we beg your Excellency to be fully convinced of the falsity of this pretense; for in reality the commandants come here mostly for the purpose of trading which becomes their principal occupation. They hold no intercourse with the missionaries, except in regard to matters which may be to their personal advantage; besides, they are hostile to the Fathers for the opposition of the latter to misconduct, which is not in accord with the service of God, and which is derogatory to the service of the King, although resulting to the advantage of the personal interests of the commandants, to which every consideration is sacrificed. This is the principal cause of the desolation of our missions through the ascendancy the commandants have obtained over the missionaries, hy assuming all authority over both the French and the Indians—that we have no other power than to labor in vain under their domination, which has gone so far as to make civil crimes and grounds for juridical accusations out of the performance of the very functions of our ministry and of our duty. This was always done hy M. de la Mothe Cadillac, who would not even allow us to use the word *desordres*, and who even brought a suit against the Father superior of the missions for having used it.¹⁰ Before

¹⁰ Antoine de La Mothe Cadillac; who was appointed commandant at Michilimacinae hy Frontenac, of whom he was a favorite, in 1694. Before proceeding to his post, he borrowed 3,750 livres, which formed part of the money he invested in *eau de vie*, etc., for trading ventures. "A Sketch of the Life of Antoine de La Mothe Cadillac," hy C. M. Burton. Detroit, 1895.

there were any commandants at this mission, the missionaries were respected and listened to by the traders; but since the commandants have been established here, the regime has changed.

The missionaries are no longer respected, they are reduced to silence, to inaction, to impotency, and to general deprivation of authority.

The commandants induced the government to place at their disposition funds for the purchase of presents and other benefits for the Indians.

This was unnecessary. The Indians needed no such stimulus.

The indiscreet methods of the disposition of this fund has excited the cupidity of the Indians, and has removed the sincerity of their natural instincts.

They have unfortunately swallowed the bait, and have become astute schemers for the spoil. But the gifts on this account have been reduced almost entirely to the single expenditure of tobacco. The residue, which is considerable, has become the perquisite of the commandants.

To all that I have said respecting the commandants, I must add—that, as there is no necessity of sending any among the Indians than that of keeping garrisons here, which must be commanded by some one—it is perfectly useless to send any; because the garrisons are quite unnecessary except for the traffic of the commandants and they are of no use either to the Indians or to the voyageurs, to whom the traffic belongs, or to the missionaries.

Your Excellency will see that I have dwelt to a great extent on the subject of commandants and garrisons, to make you understand that all the misfortunes of our missions are due to them.

It is the Commandants, it is the garrisons, who, uniting with the traffickers in *eau de vie*, have completely desolated the missions by the almost universal drunkenness and lewdness, which prevails.

The civil authorities tolerate these evils, although able to prevent them—they do not.

I have therefore no hesitation in saying to your Excellency, that if this state of things continue, we shall be compelled to abandon our missions, because we shall be unable to work for the salvation of souls.

It is for you to inform his Majesty of the extremity to which we are reduced, and to ask him for our deliverance in order that we may labor for the spread of religion without the hindrances that have hitherto impeded our work.

As regards the Detroit establishment, I have nothing to tell you about it of my own knowledge; I have no information concerning it, except through the reports of the Frenchmen and of the Indians who talk with us here about it.

Judging from their reports, it does not seem to them to be an advantageous establishment. They are not satisfied with it, for various very important reasons—which I have pointed out to the Rev. Father Superior in what I wrote for my justification against the charges brought by M. de La Mothe Cadillac, who continues to persecute me.

I would not now be in my present dilemma, had I deserved to have been accorded the favor I solicited at your hands, that of sending to the Court of France the letter containing our complaints in thirteen articles to be presented to his Majesty, begging him to do us justice against the calumnies and violence of M. de La Mothe Cadillac, and to protect us against his threats of ruining our missions, which he was then publicly uttering in the presence of the French, who listened to him with astonishment.¹¹ I foresaw very well that he was a man capable of carrying his evil designs before the Court of France, as he has already done by calumnies, and as he has quite recently done against Father Vaillant. I thought that I would forestall him, in order to prevent the effect of his threats; and I certainly would have prevented it had our complaints, which I had addressed to you, been laid before his Majesty, as I had begged you, in the name of all our Fathers, to do. But it was my misfortune not to have received that favor from you, however necessary it might have been for all of us missionaries.

He thereby derived all the advantage he desired, in order to be the first to accuse us before the French Court. His recent charges against me respecting my pretended opposition to his establishment at Detroit, you may see in my letter of justification written to the Reverend Father Superior, who will not fail to communicate it to you. Although my innocence prevents my dreading his false accusations, it is however necessary for my protection that you should do now what has not been done in the past.

Although you have not sent my letter of complaint to the Court of France, I cannot persuade myself that you should have deemed it so little worthy of consideration as not to wish at least to keep it so that you might use it in the future to do us justice in case of need. Therefore, having no doubt that you have kept it,

¹¹ These calumnies of Cadillac were his usual topics at Fort Pontchartrain; they were prominent in his voluminous correspondence with the French officials at Paris.

I beg you to be good enough to place it in the hands of the Reverend Father Superior, to whom I have written to ask you for it in my behalf.

It is the last favor and the only necessary request that I can ask of you before your departure for Europe.

I would myself have gone in person to ask you for it, on the kind invitation that you and madam have been so good as to send me to go down below, in order to give myself the consolation of paying my respects to you, of seeing you, and of conversing with both of you previous to your return to France—whither his Majesty recalls you, to occupy the position of Intendant of Havre and all its coasts. But the present condition of my divided mission which I must reunite, does not permit me to leave it in its present condition in order to give myself such consolation.

The assurance which you convey to me, in the most obliging manner possible, that you will always grant me the honor of your friendship to the extent of wishing me to write to you, notwithstanding the distance that there will be between us, about all that shall occur in our missions, and to inform you of all the need that we may have of your assistance—with the same confidence as that with which I have informed you of such need during the fifteen years while Canada has enjoyed the happiness of your presence—such an assurance, I say was needed by me to mitigate the sorrow that your departure was to cause me, and to make it more endurable to me.

Therefore you will still bear with my letters, and, if the extent and multiplicity of your occupations allow you a few moments leisure to enable you to honor me with your responses, such an honor will cause me more pleasure than I deserve.

All your family—yourself, madam, your children, and above all, our little missionary—will ever be dear to me. I shall never forget what I owe to you; and, if I can at least assure you of that of my prayers, and of the sacrifices that I shall offer to God on the altar for your preservation, for your prosperity, and for the happy administration of your Intendence, with all the success that you can desire.

I remain with all the esteem and all the respect that you deserve your Excellency's very humble and obedient servant,

STEPHEN DE CARHEIL,
Of the Society of Jesus.

P. S.—In speaking of the Detroit establishment, I forgot to tell you that during the whole time while the war lasted, the Indians desired that establishment at Detroit; because they always understood that the destruction of the Iroquoian League was intended, and that thereby they would peaceably enjoy all the lands controlled by the Iroquoian Confederacy. But since they have found that far from wishing to destroy the Iroquoian power, we thought only of sustaining it, of befriending the Confederacy by giving it land they considered as their own country, by restoring the Fort of Cataragony, they have completely changed their minds, and no longer look upon Detroit in any other light than that of an enemy's country; and by restoring the fort at Cataragony for Iroquoian benefit, this feeling has become more intense.

And, assuredly they cannot think or judge otherwise; so that those of the Huron nation who remain here and who do not wish to go to Detroit, mistrust those who have gone to settle there, and think that they go there in order to surrender to the Iroquoians, so as to join in the trade with the English.¹²

Father de Carheil in the above letter plays the part of a French *procurcur* in the emphatic manner in which he relates the scandalous doings of the Commandants, soldiers and other Frenchmen. Although his iterations may tire the reader, nevertheless, his arraignment of the government officials is such as to place them in a very bad light, historically speaking.

Among other Jesuits who had been associated with Father de Carheil was Fathers Nicholas Potier and John B. Charndon; subsequently the depopulation had become so great at Michilimacinac and at the Island of Mackinac that Father de Carheil, in 1706, abandoned the mission,¹³ burned the chapels and mission houses and returned to Quebec. But the Government induced Father James J. Marest to restore the missions at Michilimacinac; the Ottawas

¹² Jesuit Relations, Vol. 65, pp. 189 *et seq.*

who had been drawn to Detroit by Cadillac became dissatisfied to a considerable extent and many of them with their families returned to their former homes on the Island of Mackinac and to Michilimacinac. The Jesuit mission of St. Ignatius at this locality was reopened. In 1721 Father Charlevoix, S. J., as an envoy of the King of France, visited Detroit and the missions on Michigan soil in the West. These finally devolved to the care of the Jesuit Fathers, M. Louis Lefranc and Peter du Jaunay, with headquarters at Michilimacinac.

One of the out missions occasionally visited by the latter was at Arbre Croche. We find his name as a visitor to Detroit at the Huron Mission in 1765.

Both of these venerable missionaries passed to their eternal reward soon after the latter year.

Armand de La Richardie, S. J., who by the exertions of Father Charlevoix was appointed Superior of *la Mission des Hurons du Detroit*, was born in the diocese of Perigueu, France, June 7, 1686. He was of a distinguished family and uncle of the Bishop of Noyon, who was a count and peer of France. He entered the Society of Jesus in 1703, and was ordained to the priesthood in 1721. Volunteering for the Indian missions of North America, he was sent by the provincial of Aquitaine to Canada and arrived at Quebec in 1725. Designated as the founder of the Huron Mission of Detroit, he spent two years at the Huron village of Lorette near Quebec, where, instructed by Father Richer, S. J., he acquired a knowledge of the Huron dialect and then departed for the scene of his future missionary labors.¹³

¹³ Father Stephen de Carheil, S. J., after his return to the College of Quebec, rested for a while and then engaged in philological work. His biography is thus outlined.

He arrived at Quebec in 1666 and was placed with the Hurons who gave him the name of Aondechétié. After his expulsion from Cayuga, he was sent to the Ottawa missions at Michilimacinac. Shea's Missions, note, p. 289.

Who further quotes: "He had sacrificed the greatest talents in the hopes of bedewing Canada with his blood. He labored there indefatigably for more than sixty years. French and Indians regarded him as a saint and a genius of the highest order." Dr. Shea does not quote the writer of the above, but continues his own sketch, by saying: "As a philologist, he was remarkable. He spoke Huron and Cayuga with the greatest elegance, and he composed valuable works in and upon both, some of which are still extant. He died at Quebec at a very advanced age in July, 1726."

¹⁴ The Hurons had a strong castle and a large village below Fort Pontchartrain. They had the best cultivated fields on the strait and raised the finest crops. Father de la Richardie preached to them, but at first without results and he became discouraged; but he won success by prayer. His influence was such that he subsequently induced them to cross the strait and build new homes at the mission near the Point de Montreal.

As the Recollet fathers of Ste. Anne were in pastoral charge of the people of both littorals of the strait, Father de La Richardie obtained a parochial status on the south littoral and finally established the Huron mission in 1728, at the Pointe de Montreal, which locality is now known as Sandwich, Ont. There he was joined, in 1744, by Father Pierre Potier, S. J., who became his assistant and subsequently superior of the mission.

When Father de La Richardie returned to Quebec, in 1755, he was appointed vice president of the historic college of Quebec, the most ancient collegiate institution which had been established on North American soil in French or British America. His death occurred at the college March 17, 1758. His memory was held in great esteem by the religious of the Hotel Dieu of Quebec, for the services he had rendered the members of that institution during a season of great affliction.

Father Pierre Potier, S. J., who succeeded Father de La Richardie as superior of the Huron Mission of Detroit, differed in spirituality and in geniality from his superior, Father de La Richardie. He is described by Father Arthure E. Jones, S. J., archivist of St. Mary's College of Montreal, who has kindly furnished us with the authentic outlines of these distinguished missionaries of early Detroit, as a great humorist.

The highest dignitaries of Church or State did not escape the shafts of his wit. His personal correspondence is in evidence. Referring in one of his letters to the venerable Henri-Marie Dubreuil de Pontbriant, sixth Bishop of Quebec, who came to Detroit in 1755 to dedicate the fourth church of Ste. Anne, he alludes to this saintly dignitary of the Church as "Monseigneur Mitasse." The latter word meant the long red leggings, heavy and warm, in general use in Canada in winter, suggesting to the reader the antithesis of the light purple hose of the bishop. There are so many witty passages innocently written in *la vie intime*, that might be misconstrued and turned to harm, that the Jesuit custodians of St. Mary's College at Montreal, of his precious manuscripts, deem it advisable not to have them published.

The Huron Mission of Detroit was an extensive establishment. Its Church of the Assumption was finer in its appointments than that of Ste. Anne's of Detroit.

Attached to the mission, and established for the benefit of the Huron Indians, was the Mission Store. It was more heavily stocked than was any trading concern at Detroit; it was managed entirely by a lay brother.

When the Huron braves returned from their hunting fields, the spoils of the chase were brought to the Mission Store. The hunters

were not debauched with *eau de vie*, and their packs obtained at ruinous values, as was the rule with some of the tradérs at Detroit; they were paid fair prices either in money or in goods. The furs were prepared and sent to the factor of the mission in Quebec, who sent them to Europe, where they were sold by his correspondent to the best advantage. Father Potier was a great favorite in Detroit; his Easter Communion lists, year after year, included the names of the heads of the leading Catholic families of Detroit. We have several of these Easter lists.

He was probably the first Belgian priest who officiated in the vicinity of Detroit. He was born at Bandain Flanders, April 21, 1708. He entered the Jesuit novitiate of Tournai September 30, 1729. He was ordained at Douai 1741. He embarked at La Rochelle for Quebec, where he landed October 1, 1743. He studied the Huron dialect at Lorette under Father Richer, S. J., during eight months and was then sent as assistant to Father de La Richardie of the Huron Mission at Detroit, whom, as stated, he succeeded. We have published a translation and annotation of his *Livre de Compte de la Mission des Hurons du Detroit*, which, written in what Dr. Shea describes as a "microscopic hand," was a rare example of chirography dating back to the middle of the eighteenth century.

Father Potier preserved the autonomy of the Jesuit Order in America, so far as his religious establishment was concerned, until his accidental death in 1781. He had attained the age of 73, and when walking in his study it is presumed he was overcome by dizziness and fell in such a way that his skull was pierced by the ball of the andiron of the hearth. He was found dead in the morning.

The names of the Jesuit fathers who labored on the soil of Michigan between the years 1641 and 1781, with chronological approximation, may be stated as follows: Isaac Jogues, Charles Raymbaut, Gabriel X. Drouillettes, Henry Nouvel, Peter A. Bonneault, Anthony Silvy, René Menard, Louis Nicholas, John Enjalran, Charles Albanal, Peter Bailloquet, Claude Dablon, Louis André, Claude Allouez, John B. Lamorinie, James Marquette, Philip Piereson, John B. Charndon, Stephen De Carheil, Marin L. Le Franc, James J. Marest, Armand de La Richardie, Peter Du Jaunay, Peter Potier, who was the last of the illustrious twenty-four, one of whom was martyred, others who lived the lives of saints, and others whose names have become immortal in the history of America. To these names might be added that of Father Charlevoix, S. J., who spent some time while engaged in spiritual work in 1721 at Detroit, and later on in Western Michigan; as also that of Francis Vaillant de Gueslis, S. J., who came with Cadillac in 1701, but who was promptly recalled by the Father Superior of the Jesuits at Quebec. In the

acknowledged high class histories of North America great praise has been written by non-Catholic writers on these saintly and scholarly priests for their missionary work among the Indian nations, and for their intrepid and extensive explorations of the Western, the Northwestern and the Southwestern regions, which they first explored and scientifically described.

In what relates to the early history of the civilization of what now constitutes the State of Michigan, their share in that work is of glorious record. But they have had detractors! But of these, we propose to mention such only as have been identified with the history of the foundation of Detroit. It is not a grateful task to assail the memory of M. de La Mothe Cadillac, the intrepid founder of Detroit in 1701. If we have accorded his memory high praise for his successful enterprise in planting the lily banner of France on the North littoral of the strait, and for building Fort Pontchartrain, on whose site one of the finest cities in the West has since been built, it is because Cadillac's memory deserves such praise. But as to Cadillac's record during the five years previous to his advent at Detroit, the reader is referred to the letter of the saintly Father Stephen de Carheil, S. J., dated at Michilimacinac, August 30, 1702, addressed to de Callières, Governor General of New France.

Cadillac, through the favor of Count de Frontenac, was appointed commandant of Michilimacinac in 1694. Father de Carheil had had control of the several Indian missions centering at Michilimacinac. He had evangelized the Ottawas and the Hurons, and had obtained Christian control over the majority of the people of their respective tribes. He held this jurisdiction until his spiritual constituents became demoralized, after the advent of the Commandants and their limited squads of soldiers. One would infer that the post of Commandant at Michilimacinac involved military duties only. *This should have been the rule.* But the fact was that the officers sent there to command became traders, as well as the soldiers under them. Before their advent the traffic in *eau de vie* with the Indians had been limited. Cadillac before proceeding to his post as Commandant, as has been stated, had borrowed from a merchant 3,750 livres, equal to about \$5,000 at the present time.¹⁵ This he invested in trading supplies, the principal part of which included *eau de vie*. Thus equipped, he arrived at Michilimacinac. His career as commandant at the post differed but little from that of his predecessors or successors. Father de Carheil, whose soul was saddened by the debauchery of his neophytes, in sorrowful and indignant words relates the situation to Governor General de Callières.

¹⁵ A Sketch of the Life of Antoine De La Mothe Cadillac, Founder of Detroit. By C. M. Burton, 1895, p. 10.

Such is the record of Cadillac while Commandant at Michilimacinac. It cannot be condoned. His opponent, as a factor in the ruin of the Indians and in the debauchery of the Indian women at Michilimacinac, was the Jesuit, Father Stephen de Carheil. The saintliness of this missionary is of history; his words will be accepted as the truth as related in the letter referred to above.

The memory of his experience at Michilimacinac rankled in the soul of Cadillac. When appointed Commandant at Detroit he conceived the design of depopulating Michilimacinac, by inducing the Ottawas and Hurons to leave their homes on the littorals of the islands and mainlands of the upper waters, and come down and build new homes in the vicinity of Detroit. This plan was suggested to the Court of France, as the method of centralizing and organizing the Indian tribes of the West, to be controlled by France at Detroit, as a barrier to the inroads of the Iroquoian Confederacy. But the animus of Cadillac may be inferred by his averment that he would not leave Father de Carheil a member of his flock to bury him. Such indeed became the result of the exodus of the Ottawas and of the Hurons to settle at Detroit. With other Indian nations the centralization at Detroit became considerable. Several thousand Indians came there and located their cantons in the vicinity; while Michilimacinac, erstwhile an Indian missionary centre, became as such, a dreary reminder of the past.

In time the saintly Father de Carheil, in despair, decided to burn his missionary chapels and to return to Quebec. Thus was the labor of many years of Christian work at Michilimacinac, by devoted priests, temporarily suspended during the first decade of the eighteenth century. Thus was the boast of Antoine de La Mothe Cadillac, former Commandant of the post of Michilimacinac, verified.

It is to be regretted that an outline of these events, not in accordance with the relation of facts, and written with a pen at variance with the whole truth so far as Catholicity is concerned, should have been given a place in the printed records of the history of Michigan.¹⁶

In this connection it occurs to us to say that no local writer has devoted as much valuable time, or has published such accurate details of the history of Detroit and of "its dependencies," as has Clarence M. Burton; certainly no one has expended as much money as he has for the transcription of documents and records here, in Canada and in Europe, covering a period of 200 years. While his collection of Americana is second to none in the United States.

¹⁶ C. M. Burton in *Historical Collections and Researches Made by the Michigan Pioneer and Historical Society*, Vol. xxix., 1901. Detroit.

But as a historian of local affairs, we are compelled to say Mr. Burton has one great failing: he does not write impartially in what relates to events in Catholic history; while he accepts and repeats the most inconsistent slanders against the Jesuits.

This is but too evident in his memoir of Cadillac. The archives of the Marine and Colonies at Paris contain a large collection of documents relating to Detroit, the greater number of which were written by Cadillac. These documents were read and considered in the cabinet councils of Louis XIV., while the notes and comments on their respective margins are not, as a rule, creditable to the estimation in which the Commandant at Detroit was held by the ministers of the Grand Monarch. Such notations as: "He lies like a Gascon" is an index of the impression the reading of his tiresomely long documents created.

Cadillac's animosity against the Jesuits is in evidence in his communications to the government of France. When a partially successful attempt was made to burn the establishment near the fort, by which the chapel, the rectory and other buildings had been consumed, he did not hesitate to say that the incendiary had been sent expressly by Father de Carheil from Michilimacinac.

Other happenings detrimental to the welfare of Detroit were ascribed to the malevolent machinations of the Jesuit fathers.

RICHARD R. ELLIOTT.

Detroit, Mich.

THE ENGLISH EDUCATION BILL: GETTING BACK TO FIRST PRINCIPLES.

DURING the heat and stress of the debates over the Infallibility question, the opponents of the theory prophesied many dismal results should it ever be embodied in a formal definition and declared to be an article of Catholic faith. Amongst others, it was predicted as an absolute certainty that the rift between religion and the State, in regard to education, would become wider and wider with the advance of time, until at last the serpent of Secularism would devour all competing ones. In England, it was foretold, such must be the inevitable outcome. Time is a relentless dealer with rash vaticinators. Prophecies of such a kind appear to have their origin in the logic of rationalism, which by a peculiar form of irony, seems at times capable of overturning its own foundation-claim, which laughs at all pretensions of prophecy, as at everything else which does not rest on ascertained facts or tangible basis.

The secular principle did triumph for a little while in England, no doubt, because the adherents of the school of Mill and Herbert Spencer got control of the Education Department. Mr. Fawcett, a very able administrator, long directed the policy of that important branch of the Government, and Mr. Forster, who succeeded him as leader in this field, although a religious man and son of a distinguished Quaker, felt himself unequal to the task of battling with the secularists when it came to the framing of new laws for the public schools. It was he who invented and introduced the device known as the "Conscience Clause" to meet the objections of the secularists to any modicum of religious instruction as part of the public system.

Secularism has had its day. For many years it has been predominant in the formation of State policy in England, and the revolt from it which has convulsed the country almost to the verge of civil war is the best criterion of its effects. The population has sunk, not risen, in the moral scale. Infidelity has been proved to be the fruitful parent of crime. Statistics more appalling than the criminal ones for England, for the past year, have seldom been compiled. In London especially the increase in the worst forms of crime has been not merely frightful in its amount but in the character of permanency which it has assumed. The same tendency which is observed in the law of increase in the price of necessary commodities appears to pervade the ratio of criminal extension in Great Britain: ground gained is securely held and there is no retrogression. Such was the depressing keynote of the Registrar-General's last official report.

When one beholds a simultaneous increase, on the one hand, in the number of those who receive free education at the hands of the State, and on the other of those who incur the penalties of the law by the indulgence of their criminal instincts, is it fallacious to adopt the inductive process in seeking the causes of such a disquieting phenomenon? It is surely a startling hypothesis that the phenomena of increasing crime is attributable to the increased knowledge which the population acquires through the spread of the school system. But we cannot alter the logic which facts and statistics furnish. It is demonstrated by the analyses furnished by criminologists both in the United States and in Great Britain that the proportions between illiteracy and criminality are so unequal as to afford no ground for the argument that the one has any real relation to the other. Education, it is further permitted to hypothesize, is in itself conducive to the indulgence in crime, by sharpening the intellect and discovering new opportunities for the ingenuity of the wickedly inclined to develop its maladroitness powers.

English statesmen and philosophers have never displayed any particular willingness to concede any superior virtue to the system

which operates in the neighboring island. They often admit that the social condition of Ireland is highly satisfactory, and they cannot alter, if they would, what their own officials in that country have to prepare for the information of Parliament. Yet, though silence is maintained on the subject of causes, they cannot but reflect on the comparative conditions. Ireland is amongst the poorest of countries, while England claims to be the richest. According to the theories of Mill and the materialistic school, the population of Ireland ought to be among the most criminal, while that of Great Britain should show the moral effects of prosperity and contentment in a meagre bill of criminality. The secular principle in education had been rejected in Ireland; it was not suited to the genius of the people. Religion is taught in the National schools, somehow: Whateleyism has been defeated. But in England the secularist has had the upper hand for a long time. Here were factors in the problem to which no clearly thinking man could possibly shut his eyes when entering on its consideration.

But there is more than secularism in the question, so far as England is concerned. There was active infidelity, as well as the negative form inherent in mere secularism. An inquiry into the working of the "Conscience Clause," begun about seven years ago, disclosed so alarming a state of things among teachers that the Catholic Bishops of England, a few years ago, when the previous Education Bill was under the fire of discussion, passed in joint session a resolution embodying their solemn belief that unless something were done to arrest the spread of agnosticism, the country must relapse into paganism. For that reason they gave their adhesion to the Bill, unsatisfactory though it was in many respects. The principal point of difference between that Bill and all those which preceded it was in the provision under which State aid was granted to all Voluntary Schools which came up to the requirements of the central Education Board in the secular branches of knowledge. Previously the rule of the Education Board had been to recommend no grants from the Treasury except to the schools directly controlled by that Board and conforming in all things to its curriculum, as arranged in London. Religion was strictly excluded from that curriculum, in order to satisfy the objections of Nonconformists to the Church of England teaching. The number of these Voluntary Schools was great, and their poverty was great in proportion. The Bill was intended purposely to rectify the injustice of depriving them of their proper share of the school rate because they preferred a religious basis in education to the coldly secular system insisted on by the Radicals. But, with singular inconsistency, the hierarchy of the Established Church declined to follow this leading in defense of a common

religious principle. While a group of Bishops of the northern dioceses drew up a manifesto in favor of the Bill, the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London drew up a protest against it. The latter gave as reason his objection to parents being given any voice in the religious teaching of their children, as contemplated in the principle of the Bill! Surely no stickler for State ownership of the child, body and soul, could make any advance on this position.

In assenting, as it did some twenty years ago, to the principle of local School Boards, the State abandoned the position which it had occupied for the previous couple of decades on the question of popular education. No longer did it claim exclusive power over the whole system, on the ground that it possessed the lawful control in the disbursement of all the public moneys. The rights of local taxpayers had come to be recognized, and going down deeper still, the rights of particular religious denominations among the general body of taxpayers. The State abandoned every claim but the right of securing that a certain uniform level of mundane training be maintained in the general school system, as a condition of obtaining a share of the general taxation. On the surface, this was a surrender of all claim to jurisdiction by the State, so far as the spiritual side of the question was concerned. In reality it did not amount to much, since power was reserved to the central Education Board to reject teachers in Voluntary Schools on the ground of unfitness, even without stating any specific unfitness in support of the objection. The grip of the State, through the hierarchy, was still further sought to be maintained in the previous Bill, by the clause providing that the Education Department was to be the judge of what was "reasonable" and "practicable" in the arrangements to be made in any specific locality, for the teaching of religion in the Voluntary Schools.

Nonconformists were perfectly logical, according to their peculiar ideas of logic, in the strenuous opposition they offered to this proposal of the Government. They have no creed of their own but non-creed; they are the representatives of the go-as-you-please ideal of Christianity, the francs-tireurs of the great army, acting under no commander and subject to no commands or discipline. The plan to introduce the principle of denominational teaching, under the rule of the majority, appeared to them monstrous and revolutionary. And yet, if these same people stand for any principle in civil and political life, it is for that of the rule of the majority in representative government. What could better illustrate the infinite complexity of the human mind, the measureless elasticity of self-persuasive reasoning? What, except, indeed, the objection of the State Church Bishops to any parental control over the child's education?

Although the Salisbury Government was unsuccessful in its attempt to reconcile these conflicting views at that time, the fact that its successor, the Government of Mr. Balfour, found it necessary to return to the task is proof of the growth of the sentiment in favor of a return to the religious principle which confounds the vaticinations of the pessimists of thirty years ago. The Infallibility dogma has been the means of strengthening the framework of society, instead of impairing it, as predicted. Its influence is indirectly confessed in the confession of failure of the secular system in a great Protestant country, while the desperate endeavors of those who still adhere to that system, as in France, to extend it wider and wider, bears testimony to its power by the negative evidence of the dread with which it inspires these atheistical zealots. Remote, indeed, the connection between the dogma and the new Education Bill may appear; but time is working out the syllogism. Since it is found that religion is indispensable to the welfare of society, so it must ultimately be manifested that authority is indispensable to religion. The very multiplicity of sects affords a mathematical demonstration, so to speak, of the truth of this proposition; and a still more convincing test is seen in the deflection of the Anglican compass toward the Roman pole. What can be the meaning of the claim to the title Catholic, the adoption of the Catholic ritual, the profession of the Catholic sacraments, the denial of any sunderance of community, the pretended validity of the apostolic succession, but the irresistible leaven of primal authority working its way in the ecclesiastical body? The yearnings of the soul after immortality are not stronger than the yearnings of worship for authoritative direction and inerrancy in the formulation of the truths of which the forms of worship are the symbols.

It is one of the strange revenges which time often brings that those who now complain of the Nonconformist opposition to religious teaching in the public schools had been in the past leagued together to maintain a system in Ireland which had no place for God in it. One of the devices by means of which it was hoped to eliminate Catholicism in that country in process of time was the foundation of a system of Model Schools, as they were styled, for the training of teachers and the development of scientific pedagogy. After a few years it began to be perceived that the system did not fulfil the initial conception of those who proposed it, while the class of teachers which it turned out proved in many cases obnoxious to the Irish hierarchy and priesthood because of the tendencies with which their non-religious training naturally imbued them. A cry for their abandonment arose from several quarters, but the Government at that period was dogged in its adhesion to the secular idea, and the

deaf ear it turned to this cry was in no small measure due to the support it received from the great body of Bishops and clergy of the Protestant Establishment—(it was prior to the abolition of the Irish branch thereof)—who invariably resisted every proposal to recede one iota from even the most untenable position so long as such a recession indicated the confession of a mistake in the Protestant strategy. A memorial praying for the retention of the Model Schools as a public charge was prepared and received the signatures of no fewer than 2,754 “members of the United Churches of England and Ireland”—episcopal, clerical and lay—and solemnly forwarded to Parliament and laid on the table of the House. It is a little late in the day, no doubt, but at the eleventh hour the sin of these unfaithful servants is beginning to find them out. Some of them are still alive, we may certainly surmise, and they cannot but feel the operation of a retributive justice in the violent opposition of the Nonconformists to the measure on which the hopes of the English Church are now centred.

But the Nonconformists themselves cannot escape from the imputation of inconsistency in this momentous concern. While they object to the expenditure of public money on religious teaching, they made no complaint about the religious instruction which was given in the Board Schools, toward the maintenance of which the public money had been going for years. The Bishop of Salford, in a trenchant letter, put the question why this inconsistency was shown, and as no satisfactory answer was likely to be forthcoming, he furnished one himself. The religion taught in the Board Schools, he pointed out, was of the “nebulous and fragmentary” kind. It was like the earth at the dawn of creation—formless and void. This is precisely the species of religion—if one may so style it and be accurate—which suits the theory of Nonconformity. It was entirely fitting that this rebuke should come from a representative of the Catholic body in England; there was no other party to the controversy, either the Government, the Anglicans, or the Dissenters whose record was clean in the matter of consistent principle, consistent claim, or consistent opposition.

The cardinal change sought to be effected by the present Bill—(it will be an Act before these lines see the public light)—is the abolition of the School Board. In every locality this Board was to be abolished and its powers transferred, with new conditions, to the local Education Committee—as in the United States—the appointment of which was to be in the hands of the District Council: in other words, the Local Government body. It is only the secular teaching in such schools (formerly the Board Schools) that is subject to the will of the Education Committee, and this committee in

turn, all over the whole network of Local Government districts, is subject to the control of the central authority in London, the Board of Education. Over this there is no control save that exercised by Parliament, to whom it has to furnish an annual report and to render obedience in matters of policy no less than in those of detail and procedure. What the Bill proposes to do with regard to the Board Schools forms only one branch of the grievance which the Non-conformists detect in it. In respect of another set of institutions—namely, the Voluntary Schools—which figure much more largely in the educational work of the country, the principles of change, as originally proposed, were no less objectionable to the peculiar ideas of the Dissenters. The Voluntary Schools are far more numerous than the Board Schools—if we may judge from the respective numbers on the rolls of each class. While the Board Schools show a total of 2,662,669, in attendance, according to the latest report issued, the Voluntary Schools could boast of 3,043,006 on the rolls. Taken in itself, this showing indicates the strength of the sentiment which operated to induce the Government to enter on the task of reform and radical change, since the Board Schools presented far more attractions to the general mass of the people, by reason of the superior efficiency in the teaching staffs they were able to insure, by means of higher salaries and better teaching equipment, than their rivals. This advantage was no light one, as may be estimated from the fact that while the State expended the sum of £2 5s. 2d. annually on each child in the Board Schools, it contributed only £1 15s. 2d. to each Voluntary School pupil. When parents were prepared to forego the benefits represented by such a difference in cost in order to secure for their children a course of religious training definite in character instead of “nebulous,” a condition of public sentiment was revealed which only statesmen of the calibre of Combes and Waldeck-Rousseau would have the temerity to ignore.

Prior to the passing of the last Education Act (Mr. W. E. Forster's) the position of these Voluntary Schools was deplorable. They received no share of the public school fund, and were entirely dependent on private support. Their teaching staffs were much inferior to those of the Board Schools, by reason of the more generous pay these were enabled to offer, while in maintenance of the fabric and the apparatus of pedagogy their condition was sadly inferior to that of their powerful competitors. As soon as they developed a teacher of more than average excellence off he or she hied to the Board School staff, and the vacancy had to be filled by some one of more or less imperfect attainments in the same field. How the Voluntary Schools contrived to attain their present status as to number and attendance is something little short of a wonder, when

one considers the immense drawbacks under which they labored in the pursuit of their mission. No Voluntary School was allowed to be erected, with the view of getting State aid, wherever there was a Board School in existence. This rule gave a monopoly in many districts, for the more favored institution. One of the most sweeping changes proposed by the new Bill is the abolition of this monopoly. Provided parents erect suitable buildings, and the secular education imparted in them come up to the standard set up by the central authority in London, a proportionate grant will be given each school.

A very large proportion of Catholic children have had to attend the Board Schools, rather than the other class, owing to the poverty of their parents; and of this number a very considerable percentage were the children of Irish parents. This fact formed the basis of an appeal made for Irish support for the Bill by Cardinal Vaughan and a number of the English Catholic clergy. Out of this appeal arose a controversy and a division in Ireland which at one period assumed a very embittered tone and threatened the gravest political consequences.

If the question at issue was simply one of supporting or not supporting a measure which brought help to struggling Catholic schools as well as recognition of the principle of religious education, then there can be no doubt but that the Irish Nationalist members would have been false to Catholic principles had they allowed their resentment over political injustice to overcome their allegiance to those principles. But in reality the question was by no means so simple as it looked to those who blamed while they did not take the trouble to examine. Events in England showed that a very different Bill might emerge from the crucible of debate from that which had been cast into the melting pot. So loud were the cries of the Nonconformists, and so apprehensive grew many of the Unionist and Tory parties, that Mr. Chamberlain was compelled to go down to Birmingham to meet his supporters in conference and to threaten a dissolution were they to persist in the opposition which many of them threatened. The Government would stand or fall by the Bill, he emphatically declared. But this valorous pronouncement was somewhat discounted by the hints which the speaker gave that the Government would not oppose substantial modifications in the shaping of the Bill. How far these alterations might go no man could guess. Moreover, there began to appear in the English press sundry formidable objections to the proposals of the Bill, even from Catholics. It was pointed out that under the provisions of the Bill, as originally proposed, any Voluntary School, in order to secure an

appropriation or a share of the public rates, must be maintained at the standard of efficiency, both as to the building itself, its equipment, and its teaching power, that came up to the Education Department's requirements. This would mean a permanent addition to the cost of the Voluntary School, with no prospect of that addition being made good from any source. But even among the supporters of the Government itself similar apprehensions of disastrous effects to the schools it was intended to help were entertained. Mr. Chaplin, who is no alarmist, but a Tory of the most respectable type, and head of the Agricultural Department, went so far as to speak against the principle of the Bill in relation to the Voluntary Schools, at a meeting of the Central Chamber of Agriculture, and to move a resolution declaring "That the cost of education should be borne as far as possible by the National Exchequer and not by local rates." The Education Bill was introduced in the hope that Voluntary Schools would be kept upon their legs for many years to come. It was, he thought, quite likely to have an opposite effect. Owing to the falling off in agricultural values, owners of estates who had built and maintained Voluntary Schools were no longer able to maintain them. It was only human nature that many owners would be disinclined to pay both rates and voluntary subscriptions for the same thing, and therefore the Bill was likely to ring the death knell of Voluntary Schools. It must be owned that such a view, supported by the reasons given by the speaker, seemed perfectly sound and rational. Mr. Chaplin, from his official position, spoke authoritatively: he knew his facts, and his deductions were in accord with human nature and common sense. It would really seem, however, that there was no agreement among the Ministers themselves concerning the spirit and scope of the change they asked the Houses of Parliament to approve and legalize. To the strenuous assertions of the Nonconformists that the Bill proposed to put the whole educational system of the country "under the heel" of the parson and the priest, Mr. Balfour hotly retorted in a public speech. He said that under the existing system in a vast number of parishes there was what was called "a one-man control, being the control of the parson or clergyman of the parish. He asked: "But what is the system which this bill introduces? That is the point. I say that whereas the clergyman of the parish is at present sole manager of the education of his parish, now, under the Bill *he will be one of six.*"

The Bill proposed to add to this clerical manager, priest or parson, five laymen, two of them very likely, in many cases certainly, not belonging to the same denomination as himself.

These proposals effectually disposed of the cry of clerical absolut-

ism on the one hand and the absence of popular control on the other. But the repudiation conveyed in Mr. Balfour's explanations is hardly reconcilable with the behavior of the members of the Government during the progress of the debate. For example, we find in some of the Parliamentary reports that the House of Commons witnessed the strange phenomena of repeated outbursts of cheering on the Ministerial benches over points made by an Irish member in support of the Bill. The member was Mr. T. M. Healy. He was speaking in approval of the courage of the Government in insisting on the right of the parent to have his child brought up in his (the parent's) religion, and in adopting the principle of denominational religious education; and he said, amongst other things:

It is said that the Church people, having a majority, are anxious to have religion taught in the schools, and the Nonconformists, being in a minority, and believing that the Church religion would be taught in the schools, would remove religion generally from the schools. I do not believe that that is a secularist attitude. Well, now it is said that apparently the Government are a little alarmed and do not venture to take up boldly, according to some of their organs, the question of the necessity for religious education. I feel under no such disability whatever. I believe that the whole reason for these anarchist movements which have disturbed Europe and led to the assassination of the Presidents of the United States and the French Republic have been due to the expulsion of God from the schools.

Loud Ministerial cheers greeted these allusions to the motives of the Government, as the published reports showed. From this we infer either of two things: that Mr. Balfour desired to get credit for establishing the principle of increased popular control over the schools, under the pretext of a desire to aid the poor Voluntary Schools, while his companions in the Cabinet were equally desirous of getting all the credit they could for a sincere desire to restore religion in the schools, as the only means of mitigating the evils which the anarchistic propaganda is bringing on society.

Mr. Healy was a little too generous with the Nonconformists. The Bishop of Salford's estimate of their attitude and their motives seems to be much sounder, as his knowledge of the situation is greater and deeper. It was an exceedingly difficult and complicated problem to take up, when the Government of Mr. Balfour began. Still he himself was pledged to it, and there was nothing to be gained by either abandonment or procrastination with regard to it. The grievances of the Voluntary Schools only grew with delay in coming to their assistance, as Mr. Balfour had promised he would, when the former Education Bill collapsed by its own weight as much as want of backbone on the part of the Ministry that essayed to carry it through. The elementary school system of England, when the new measure was introduced, embraced in all the formidable number of twenty thousand such establishments. Of these only about six thousand were "Secular" schools; the remainder were "Voluntary," or denominational. The latter were maintained

chiefly by private benevolence; the Education Department, under certain conditions, granted a little help. Of all the Voluntary Schools, those belonging to the Roman Catholic system were the most woe-begone. Members of that system in England for the most part belong to the poorest section of the population. Teachers' salaries depended on the number of school attendants. Poor parents are unable to send their children to school with the regularity of the well-to-do; hence in some districts the results' fees of the Board School teacher might be nearly double those of his fellow in the Catholic Voluntary School. It was not merely the monetary loss which affected the unlucky teacher: his professional standing was injured by the low attendance as well. Irregularity in attendance meant also retrogression to the pupil; and when the inspector came around he made two unfavorable remarks on the character of the school, and this meant a double loss to the helpless pedagogue. Catholic Voluntary Schools were, therefore, conducted under the most disheartening conditions; their standard was low; many parents sent their children to the Board Schools in preference. More than one thousand of the Voluntary Schools, notwithstanding these depressing conditions, continued to exist, in some sort of fashion, and it was this fact that moved Cardinal Vaughan to take the bold course of addressing a letter to Mr. John E. Redmond, as chairman of the Irish Parliamentary Party, soliciting the help of those representatives in the passage of the Bill. Notwithstanding the arbitrary action of the Government which His Eminence asked these representatives to support, in the enforcement of the Coercion Act in Ireland, it was still believed that they would subordinate their natural resentment to their feeling as Catholics, more especially when it was shown that a large proportion of the children affected by the existing law belonged to the Irish section of the population. Not often have political entanglements developed a situation so complicated with the passions of party conflict and the claims of religious obligation. It resembled that crux presented to Desdemona, in the play, when she found herself confronted with "a divided duty."

If no great alacrity was exhibited by those thus uniquely appealed to in acting as implored, it would be unjust to lay their apparent supineness at the door of either indifference or obstinate hostility to the Government which asked for their votes while it scourged their country. It was soon shown to be a wise conservatism. The structure of the Bill was undergoing alarming modifications before their eyes, day by day. The cloud which at one moment looked like a weasel in the next seemed very like a whale. One amendment to the Bill, offered by a military member of Parliament, Colonel Kenyon-Slaney, and *accepted by Mr. Balfour*, was so openly at variance

with the professed object of the whole measure—*i. e.*, recognizing and assisting the principle of religion and the right of the parent, in education, that even the *Tablet*, which reflects the views of Cardinal Vaughan, as commonly believed, protested vigorously against the application of this amendment to the Catholic schools. As for the Anglicans, they were simply plunged into a state of hopeless dolor at the prospect conjured up as a result of this amendment, whose passage became almost a certainty once the Government had decided on accepting it.

To understand the alarm of the Anglicans (High as well as Low and Broad Church) over this amendment, it should be understood that many of the Voluntary Schools controlled by this divided body were held under trusts which laid down strict rules as binding on both executors and managers, on the variety of Anglicanism that was to be taught in them. By the terms of the Kenyon-Slaney amendment, the principle of popular control was to modify the laws laid down by the founders of such schools on the subject of religious teaching. According to a Parliamentary return issued recently, while the debate was in progress, there were no fewer than nine thousand of all the Voluntary Schools described as Church of England endowments, which had been erected and maintained entirely out of private resources, and therefore absolutely devoid of any feature which would justify arbitrary interference by the Government or the public with their control or management, whether as to secular or religious teaching. The Kenyon-Slaney amendment would give local authorities power to interfere with this exemption, and would initiate the rivalry between the parson and the layman—the long-standing cause of Bedlam scenes in Synods and annual meetings—in places where the calm of the parson's sway had been for generations unbroken. By the concessions made *prior* to the introduction of this amendment the Anglican losses on the measure denounced by the Nonconformists were thus summed up by an indignant Vicar in the *Guardian*:

1. Our freedom as managers. 2. The *certainty* that we shall be allowed to teach the catechism, or, indeed, *any* religion. 3. The power to dismiss a teacher who, whilst keeping the Church teaching going in the school, entirely neglects the duty of public worship, or is openly antagonistic to the clergy of the parish. 4. The free use of our schools, which we have built, on three evenings of the week. Who is to decide as to which evenings are to be left us? How is this to be distinguished from confiscation? 5. Our endowments are to be confiscated. 6. We are to be responsible for ground rents, hitherto paid out of school funds, and for *all* repairs, down to broken windows and whitewashing. Hitherto most of these have been paid for out of school funds.

We may sympathize with the plight of the Anglicans, in presence of so great an encroachment on their peaceful pastures. But there is in the result some suggestion of the working of that mysterious law which attends apparent success in former revolts against

authority. "Even-handed justice commends the poisoned chalice to our own lips." Their system had its beginning on the encroachments of the secular power on the domain of the temporal; and now they lament most dolefully when the State, in its turn, proposes to interfere with prerogatives which they deemed secure in perpetuity. They represent the principle of successful confiscation; their Church, like old Babylon superimposed upon older Nippur, has been reared on the spoils of the ancient Church in England.

To many outsiders the attitude of the Irish Bishops over the question appeared a mystery. As a body they made no public sign, but individual members like Cardinal Logue, the Bishop of Elphin, and a few others had written or spoken something to show that they were in accord with Cardinal Vaughan's appeal. But this inaction was only apparent. In reality they had been acting in the wisest way. So far back as the 6th of October last the Bishops of Clonfert and Waterford, on behalf of the Standing Committee in session at Maynooth College the previous day, had written to Mr. Redmond as chairman of the Irish Parliamentary party to intimate the wish of that committee (representing, presumably, the whole, or the great majority, of the episcopal body) that the letter of His Eminence be favorably considered at the regular meeting of the Irish members then about to be held. Mr. Redmond's reply to that communication was sent the following day; but it was not until the 28th of November that either of these documents saw the light in the public press. This delay might seem extraordinary were it not for the fact that the correspondence assumed for the time a confidential character. In Mr. Redmond's letter it was pointed out to the Irish prelates that it was the practice of the Irish party, in such cases as formal deliberations over the course to be taken by the party as a whole, to keep the decision taken secret until the time came to act, so as to leave their adversaries in the House of Commons in doubt as to the side on which their votes would be cast in critical emergencies. At the same time the party candidly stated the view that, grievous though the wrongs of the Catholics in England might be under the school laws, the Catholics of Ireland had to endure far more serious injustice in consequence of the failure of the Government to deal with the claims for National Self-government, a Catholic University, and the agrarian problem—all of which affected the very existence of the Irish people in their own country. If the Irish members were found willing to condone such grievances, Mr. Redmond went on to say, the inevitable effect of such an attitude must be to destroy their influence as a party and expose them to the contempt of the Government and the British people. It cannot be denied that such a view of the case was in accord with the historical aspect of constitu-

tional development through political parties. Ireland has had the most disastrous experience of the unwisdom of that statesmanship which would seek through open alliance with British parties or Parliamentary groups to attain national ends. It is to be assumed that the Irish Bishops, or at least some of them, were not insensible to the force of this reasoning. Their action did not seem to be unanimous or decided, as debate went on. This, indeed, was not to be wondered at. Chameleon-like changes were going on before all eyes as the struggle at Westminster began to develop the resources of the opposition and the pliability of the Government. Passions and interests that had not been dreamed of began to start up in a thousand directions. The *odium theologicum*—the last thing the Government would have cared to invoke—suddenly showed itself, so that Parliament toward the end of the first stage of the Bill found itself suddenly threatened with the portentous problem of High Church or Low Church, and wandering in a labyrinth whose intricacies might lead in the end to the path of disestablishment for the Church which tries to sit on both stools. The Ministry was placed in a pitiable plight, now giving a sop to the High, now to the Low; anon throwing a bone to the lay commoner, again placating the country squire—the “lay impropiator” as he has been called, in many places—by giving him a voice potential in the management of the local school. The Bill, as a result of these mal-dexterous manœuvres, assumed a shape almost the converse of that which it bore at the beginning. Starting out with the avowed purpose of relieving the Voluntary Schools, it ended its course—for the time—by giving to the opponents of these schools everything they demanded, all at the expense of the denominationalists. This pathetic surrender was explained by Mr. Balfour as the result of the agitation gotten up by the Nonconformists. The Ministry, he told the House of Commons, were “actually stunned” at the volume and strength of that agitation. This was a humiliating admission for any persons claiming to be regarded as statesmen to make. Mr. Balfour would not deny that he claims to be a statesman. He has now been more than twenty years in the front ranks of the British Ministerialists, doing the highest sort of governmental work. Men called upon to fulfil such duties ought certainly to have an intimate knowledge not only of the material condition but of the sentiments of the people for whom they legislate. After Mr. Balfour’s confession, such a view must be accepted with reserve.

The situation, immediately before the Bill had been rushed through the Commons by means of a merciless closing of debate, was thus eloquently summarized by a distinguished English priest: “It (the Bill) deals most ungenerously with denominationalists; for

them it means a maximum of sacrifice and a minimum of advantage. In spite of this we are willing to accept it; but when the day of reckoning comes we are not likely to forget that we have been betrayed by a Government that was pledged to do us justice. And any one who carefully weighs on the one hand the signal advantage that the Bill confers on Nonconformists, the Nonconformist grievances it remedies at the expense of denominationalists, and on the other how it increases the burdens of denominationalists, and leaves their grievances unredressed will be disposed to think that the Bill may be not incorrectly described as 'The Nonconformist Relief Bill of 1902.' " Mr. Balfour himself had almost paraphrased this description of his great measure, in a public speech. Such being the case, it is little wonder that the propriety of supporting it should not have been very clear to Irish Catholic members of Parliament.

As for the Catholic schools, there is no justification whatever for the application of the Kenyon-Slaney amendment to these establishments. Cleric and layman are not at odds as to the doctrines taught in them. If lay influence was to be introduced as the price of State aid in the secular work performed by these schools, the singular spectacle would be presented of a number of gentlemen undertaking to dictate in matters of which they had not the smallest knowledge, and to which they were in sentiment, and mayhap in practice, hostile—since necessarily, being chosen on the elective principle as representative ratepayers, they must in English constituencies, be chiefly taken from the non-Catholic body.

But if Irish Catholic members were expected to lend their support to the Government in passing the Education Bill as a whole, whatever its ultimate shape, it is difficult to see how they could be asked to help in passing it with the Kenyon-Slaney amendment tacked on. If for the sake of a paltry contribution from the public rates the principle of interference with Catholic teaching were to be sanctioned, where would be the gain? In any event, the gain would seem to be altogether problematical, since the standard of repair and efficiency insisted on as a *sine quâ non* to the granting of local or State aid must entail additional expense to an amount altogether beyond the possibilities of surmise. They were blamed for not attending to help to defeat that amendment; but suppose in defeating it they also defeated the Government, and so lost the Bill, what would have been said of them?

Down to the last moment the uncertainty over this measure can be compared to nothing more illustrative than the fluctuations of the race for the Derby. In rapid change of view, in the alternations of hope and fear, now on this side, now on that, in readjustment of proposals to altered situation, no Parliamentary struggle in contem-

porary history presents such kaleidoscopic transformations as the course of this singular measure. It is gratifying to chronicle that there was no eventual break between the Irish episcopate and the political representatives over it. Undecided as to the situation as they were, the latter yielded to the Bishops' opinion that they had better be in their places, ready to safeguard Catholic interest, when the final chapter was reached. They were back in Westminster just in time to meet the Bill on its return from the House of Lords, after passing through the Committee stage there, with several amendments of a mischievous character—from a Catholic standpoint—tacked on. These the Irish party with much cheerfulness assisted in defeating. Immense efforts had been made by the Anglican bishops and clergy to get the House of Lords to make such alterations in the Bill as would diminish the Nonconformist victory or avert some of the evils which they foresaw as a result of the measure passing in the shape in which it had left the Lower House. A protest against the Bill was drafted, and a copy was sent to every member of the House of Lords. The Peers were told that if the Bill passed in that shape, many of the poorer schools would have to be closed. The Bishops in the House protested strongly, but they seem to have been almost alone in their opposition, since when the division on the second reading was taken there were only thirty-seven "noes" to a hundred and forty-seven "ayes" among the Peers. What the nature of the amendments agreed to in the "gilded chamber" had been, we know not at this writing, but they must have been damaging to the Voluntary principle else the Irish forces would not have joined so readily with those of the Government to overthrow them. Although the managers of Catholic schools were crying out that Mr. Balfour had betrayed them, by yielding everything that the Nonconformists demanded, the path of duty still seemed to point in this direction. As these schools could not have increased financial support unless at the cost of abandoning some control, it was deemed best to secure that support for the present and trust to time and a more favorable opportunity to bring about a redress of the unequal balance.

To sum up: it is plain that though the British Government, by the introduction of such a Bill, has acknowledged the necessity of religious instruction, and thereby paid tribute to the principle which the Catholic Church never abandoned, it has, for the sake of victory in the fight, gone nearly as far to taking away with one hand what it gave with the other as any disciples of the rule of expediency possibly could.

JOHN J. O'SHEA.

Philadelphia.

THE LITERATURE OF DIRT, DOUBT AND DESPAIR.

THE alliteration in the above title may seem both captious and fanciful, yet it is anything but artificial. Read Naturalism for Dirt, Agnosticism for Doubt, and Pessimism for Despair; and at once you have the philosophic and literary terms for three diseases which ravaged the literature of the last century to a frightful degree, and still threaten further evils. The average reader and student hear very little of them under their proper names. There has been long and heated discussion of the decadence of English literature during the last twenty years; and also of the confusion existing among the leading men of letters, a confusion of thought, of methods, and of ideals. Decadence and Confusion are two very apt words, which nicely describe the results of the three *isms*. They are the children of Dirt, Doubt and Despair in current literature. Used without proper reference to their parentage, however, they conceal, for the average reader, their shameful origin.

It is not difficult to follow the decline of originality and power in English letters for the past quarter of a century, since the facts are notorious. Tennyson and Longfellow have left no successors; neither have Carlyle and Lowell; and the same thing may be said of Dickens and Thackeray. The industry of present writers, in the matter of quantity, is beyond praise. The literary prizes are valuable. Never was the demand for good and bad literature so large and so full of profit, never has style been so appreciated, never has the world been so willing to recognize genius. Yet genius does not abound. On the contrary, mediocrity has taken its place, as is well known, and men ridicule it without mercy. What it lacks in genius is made up for by pose. Zangwill, an English writer, said of the modern play that it consisted of snivel, drivel, and devil. It may be said of the modern writer that he is made up of much prose and more pose. The pose is a necessity. The banjo-poets, the mandolin-novelists, and the hurdy-gurdy essayists of the time, as one is tempted to name them, must make a large appearance, if they are to persuade the world of their ability. The English literary world has become a gigantic vaudeville, where continuous performances give us varieties of cleverness, but nothing sublime. So sound an authority as Mr. Kipling has lamented this decline, and hoped that its cause might be found, and the descent checked.

In a question so complex causes are not to be traced easily, even when the conditions are favorable. Here there are no favorable conditions. Confusion reigns in the literary world more absolutely than in the religious. The Church still dominates the religious

world of thought, and disputants usually argue for or against her; but a pleasant anarchy in the literary kingdom makes every writer a little king. The critics naturally have attempted to account for the decline, and have failed as naturally, because they have been most affected by it. Good literature develops good critics, but good critics do not develop good literature. When decline or decadence comes, the critics are the first to show the symptoms. At the present moment it is to be feared that they are a hopeless crew, so fallen into routine as to be of one pattern, like jumping-jacks; get their pegs and their strings and all will jump together the same way. For example, they have been discussing for many years the threatened Decadence and the existing Confusion. How much have they contributed to our knowledge of the causes? One must believe that the lights of criticism know something of the causes; but the flood of minor criticism, which for two decades has been deluging the magazines, reviews and literary histories, has carried no information in its tide. The mental condition of the average reader, after a course in current criticism, must be very curious. His knowledge of the literary past has been gained from the popular histories and the entertaining articles of Edmund Gosse in the reviews, two sources of inextricable confusion. His acquaintance with the literary present is made through the book magazines, and the reviews in the daily and weekly journals: their contradictions, innumerable and cheap, have a rich source in ignorance, in laziness, and sometimes in venality. His acquaintance with the current literature of foreign countries comes through the fine-flavored descriptions of publishers who are selling translations of Zola, d'Annunzio and others of that tribe. Moreover, the honest and sincere criticism of capable men is not only rare, but often vitiated by their point of view, which corresponds with a subjective, not an objective, standard of taste. Therefore, the condition of the average reader is most pitiable.

One is bound to admit at the outset the difficulty of rescuing him, of leading him out of the confusion and explaining to him the cause of decadence. For the Catholic, the task is simple enough: since both decadence and confusion are the logical result of the attempt to get rid of The Christ, that is, the Christian principle, in literature. There is no need to discuss the history of the assault made by the great writers of the last century on the Christian principle. It is a well known matter; what the consequences have been is not so well known. The Christian reasons somewhat in this fashion on the question: literature may be defined as the expression, in the most exquisite forms of speech, of man's thought and feeling about his own destiny: the beliefs and hopes of men shape largely their literature: the more nearly and perfectly a literature expresses the faith

and hope of a people, the closer will it come to perfection; now, it is an historic fact that the principle which, almost exclusively, has informed modern literature, and the standard set for that literature, are the gift of Christ to mankind: the standard is His philosophy of the spiritual life, whose horizon is eternity, whose essence is immortality: the principle is Himself, to quote His own words, I am the way and the life: therefore, the nearer a literature keeps to Christ, the greater will be its perfection: neglect of Him means decay, and hostility to Him means destruction, truths expressed by Himself in the prophetic sentence, he that is not with Me is against Me, and he that gathereth not with Me scattereth. This rather brief summing up of the Christian reasoning has at least the merit of clearly locating the Christian position. It may be strikingly illustrated by historical instances. The Emperor Julian rejected Christ as a principle for all departments of human activity, and turned to the old order of things for a principle of regeneration; Arius asserted the sufficiency of human genius for the rehabilitation of man; Mahomet declared the incompleteness of the work of Christ; Luther affirmed the defectibility of the organization, the Church, which Christ founded: and the four failed disastrously in the sight of all men. As nothing human moves without a principle, which alone can determine the method, the modern enemies of Christ, like those mentioned above, have been forced to find a substitute for Him in politics, in art and in letters. The effort has been quite as disastrous to the men of letters in our time as to the men of old. It has led to confusion and decadence. Many principles have been tried, of which the three most important have been chosen for discussion in this article. It is profoundly interesting to see what great minds have accomplished with such frightful principles as Dirt, Doubt, and Despair.

Let us begin with Pessimism, as the least important and least successful. It is the name of a theory of existence which holds that our planet is about the worst any creator could have made. A contented, well-fed and wealthy German popularized it among thinkers and readers some eighty years ago in Germany. Schopenhauer is a name that one could conjure with in New England fifty years back, and it still commands respect with a few. This worthy philosopher, applying his theories to human life, proposed as the secret of happiness that man should cultivate *the will not to live*. His philosophy for a time had some vogue on the continent, and, as a substitute for the Christian theory, finally made its way among English-speaking peoples. Its principle may be stated thus: this world is man's grave; and its chief postulate: the world should be enjoyed. But a very brief experience proved its unfitness for the optimistic,

active and successful populations which speak the English tongue. As far as I can discover only one direct attempt was made to popularize Pessimism as a literary principle in this country, and that was the work of an ambitious professor of philosophy, Mr. Edgar Saltus, whose latest effusions appear regularly in one of the sensational dailies under such titles as "Hygienic Kissing." Mr. Saltus undertook the task of introducing what he called The Philosophy of Disenchantment into our literary life, both in the shape of the essay and the novel. The essays were dull, and the novels vile, and both failed financially and artistically. However, pessimism has had a large influence, indirectly, through the popular writers whose principles or methods lead finally to despair. Matthew Arnold, George Eliot and Swinburne in England; Thoreau, Emerson and Ingersoll in this country gave it, from different points of view, a distinct impetus. The healthy temper of the people, however, forced these writers to make modifications, at least in the expression of the theory. They adopted, with the exception of Swinburne, the cheerful phrase, courage and candor, as a sort of balance to Schopenhauer's phrase, *the will not to live*. Throughout their utterances one meets constantly the recommendation to meet the situation called life with candor, to lay bare its bleak hopelessness, to recognize its bitter limitations, and to accept them with the courage of the martyr. Mr. Robert Ingersoll, who was not a literateur, but who was a teacher for a stupider class of people than followed the Arnolds and the Eliots, found it necessary to appeal steadily for a lofty development of the affections in man, and to ornament the grave with roses, lilies and white marbles, in order to secure his following, and to keep them enchanted with pessimism. In time the catchword of courage and candor failing to please sufficiently, the gospel of Altruism had to be preached, both for the encouragement of the teacher and the entertainment of the multitude. The last stage of popular pessimism was its general attack on the shams of the age, a trick of politics which is certain to attract and hold public attention for a time.

The effect of pessimism upon the literary productions of its advocates proved its uselessness as a living principle. Arnold never had spontaneity, either in prose or poetry, and consequently his work could ill bear the chilling influence of pessimism. Wherever it dominates his verse, the poems have the frosty outline of old-fashioned tombstones. George Eliot's genius withered under it absolutely; it reduced Emerson to froth, and made Thoreau a gabbler. If it failed as a substitute for the Christian principle, nevertheless it seems to run with the larger part of serious literary effort in the past half century. One finds it as an after-taste in the mouth,

even with so optimistic a poet as Tennyson, even in such vital verse as Browning's. Swinburne accepted it as one accepts the lees in the wine when the cup is finished. With the brutal honesty of his kind he expressed his disgusted conviction promptly, refusing to pamper himself with the catchwords of Arnold and Eliot and Emerson. These sober and serious writers saw the grave from afar, and approached it with dignity; Swinburne found it yawning for the drunken votaries at the very doors of the temple of Venus, and he sang:

Though one were strong as seven
He too with death shall dwell,
Nor wake with wings in heaven,
Nor weep with tears in hell.
Though one were fair as roses,
His beauty clouds and closes,
And well though love reposes,
In the end it is not well.

We are not sure of sorrow,
And joy was never sure.
To-day will die to-morrow;
Time stoops to no man's lure.
And love, grown faint and fretful,
With lips but half regretful,
Sighs, and with eyes forgetful,
Weeps that no loves endure.

From too much love of living,
From hope and fear set free,
We thank with brief thanksgiving,
Whatever gods may be,
That no life lives forever,
That dead men rise up never,
That even the weariest river
Winds somewhere safe to sea.

Then star nor sun shall waken,
Nor any change of light:
No sound of waters shaken,
Nor any sound or sight.
Nor days nor things diurnal,
Nor wintry winds nor vernal;
Only the sleep eternal
In an eternal night.

The second attempt to find a substitute for the Christian principle in literature came into being under the title of Naturalism, and Swinburne was its most enthusiastic and determined promoter. The new principle expressed itself clearly in the formula: nature is sufficient. The world had enough of beauty, and the life of man sufficient strength and variety, to satisfy all needs and inspire the greatest of poets. This was simple, comprehensible to king and clown, universal and everlasting as nature itself. Three men made Naturalism popular and famous: Swinburne in England, Walt Whitman in America, and Emile Zola for the whole world. Each of these men started from his own point of view. Swinburne was a genius as well as a man of pleasure. For him there could be no evasions in aim or method. He understood clearly and accepted cheerfully the apostasy from the Christ, the worship of Venus. Here are his own words in the Hymn to Proserpine:

Of the maiden thy mother men sing as a goddess with grace clad around;
Thou art throned where another was king; where another was queen she is crowned.

Yea, once we had sight of another; but now she is queen, say these.
Not as thine, not as thine was our mother, a blossom of flowering seas,
Clothed round with the world's desire as with raiment, and fair as the foam,
And fleetier than kindled fire, and a goddess, and mother of Rome.
For thine came pale and a maiden, and sister to sorrow; but ours,
Her deep hair heavily laden with odor and color of flowers,
White rose of the rose-white water, a silver splendor, a flame,
Bent down unto us that besought her, and earth grew sweet with her name.
For thine came weeping, a slave among slaves, and rejected; but she
Came flushed from the full-flushed wave, and imperial, her foot on the sea.

Through a flood of splendid and blasphemous verse this poet

arrived speedily at the goal of Naturalism: the grave. His disappointment was as savagely frank as his first enthusiasm, and nothing in his poetry is more terrible than his lashing of his own gods at the discovery of their littleness. Lust and beauty and life and activity were his themes; he sang to them as the ancient poets sang to their deities, with many a bitter fling at Christ and His Mother; until the horror of the grave seized him, and he discovered that for such as he there is no god but death, the extinguisher of life and beauty and lust and activity. When that conviction reached him, Swinburne forsook both gods and poetry, and troubled men no more with his blasphemous songs.

Walt Whitman had the poetic fibre, but one doubts if he ever had the mind to grasp a theory like a philosopher or a Swinburne. Certainly he thought less of principle and method than he did of the deficiency which he had observed in the poetry of the time. It failed to sing the praise of lust with the right attention to details. Whitman spent his energies in supplying the deficiency. He is therefore more obscene than Swinburne, with less intention and desire to be obscene; and at the same time less suggestive, utterly without blasphemy, and often ridiculous. Nevertheless he sang the Song of Dirt loudly and effectively, and pattered away into a foolish old age without ever guessing his relationship to Swinburne, or the good work he had done for Venus. He had no imagination, and no logic, and never saw with the horrified eyes of his English master the yawning grave. These two poets affected only the more cultivated readers, and, while their influence may be more permanent in consequence, it had never the sweep and immediate power which belonged to Emile Zola. The millions read Zola. Swinburne sang only of what he considered the beautiful in Nature; Whitman, with the same thought, but less discerning, included the ridiculous; both poets excluded the repulsive carefully. Zola brought a different spirit to his exposition of life, the spirit of impartiality. He described small-pox destroying one of his characters with as much ardor as Swinburne sang the birth of Venus. He worked indeed upon the same principle, the sufficiency of Nature, but with a peculiar postulate: everything should be told. Now to describe everything without reserve requires exaggeration and much language. The latter produces tedium, and the former destroys perspective. Zola did not seem to have a true sense of proportion, a right idea of perspective. Most of his books leave the impression on the reader of something monstrous, unnatural. Without intending it, he became the greatest exponent of Dirt that any age of the world has seen; not merely the dirt of the brothel, but also of the hospital, the shambles, the sewer, the muck-heap and the dissecting-room. It

seems incredible that a writer of such talent and industry, a man of the world of intellect, should have taken such a course. Swinburne has the excuse of tradition, and Whitman of ignorance. Without precedent or guide Zola cut a road for himself through the backyards of men. And for many a year the big and little critics of the land praised his work, and made his latest book the occasion of an ecstasy.

Apart from the disgust which his stories arouse, a statement of the leading features in any one of his novels is amusing. Thus, in *Doctor Pascal* a child dies in his sleep from nose-bleed, an old man perishes in a drunken stupor from spontaneous combustion, an uncle and niece fall in love, and the hero dies a slow death from angina pectoris. The reader is entertained in precisely the same fashion as if he sat out each painful scene like an attendant nurse, with the requirement that he report each case to the government. It is a good illustration of the rule to tell everything. The blood drips with terrible monotony from the weak veins of the sleeping child to the table, and from the table to the floor; and the only witness is a crazed and helpless grandmother to whom the sight of blood brings back a long-forgotten horror with a shock that mercifully kills. The old man in spontaneous combustion sits in his chair burning like a smoky lamp, filling the house with putrid odors, deserted by the relative who might have saved his worthless life, but thought nature should be left to its good work. The hero Dr. Pascal passes calmly through each stage of painful heart failure, with purple face and straining eyes, to the end; he has his witness also, the niece whom he loves, whose presence intensifies the anguish of death. One feels that the story is told less as a story than for the opportunity to describe death from slow hemorrhage, spontaneous combustion and heart failure. The limitations of his principle and his method Zola made very clear in his "*La Faute d'Abbe Mouret*." The aim of this story is to show how in certain conditions the forces of nature and of artificial civilization are almost equally balanced, now one and then the other winning the victory in an endless struggle. The Abbe Mouret, virtuous, devoted, and even experienced young priest, represents the false civilization for Zola; an untrained peasant girl, isolated from her kind, savage and clever, represents the principle, nature is sufficient. As it was to be a story of primitive love, Zola attempted to make it a prose-poem, and succeeded sufficiently to win the praise of the (then less) judicious Andrew Lang. The coloring is sensual to a degree, all the natural scenes are painted with the brush of Venus, and everything leads up to the climax of unconscious sin in a place modeled on the garden of paradise. The chastity of the untrained

heroine is deftly contrasted with that of the faultless Abbe. Zola read all the books in France on the training of a priest, and talked with former students and very retired priests. The result is a remarkable burlesque, which cannot but rouse laughter, and at the same time admiration for the thoroughness of the author's reading. The priest is a wonder of correctness and virtue. Yet nature in an unguarded moment conquers him, but is quickly and cruelly overthrown, while ecclesiasticism riots in cruelty in revenge for one really sinless slip.

The literary character of the tale must have been good to win the praise of honest critics; yet there is nothing falser in the work of Zola than this story, nothing more banal, nothing more offensive to good taste and sound sense. But unquestionably he had power. His study of certain conditions in France was a protest and a warning in the shape of the novel called "*Fecondité*." It is not really a story, but a state document. Like most of his work it is horrible in its presentation of the under world; nevertheless in this case the horror makes for power; but the effect is weakened by the bad logic, the foul odors of crime, the tedium of six hundred pages, the long period of fifty years. One feels at the close that fifty years of horror and tedium have passed since the book was opened. None the less is the book powerful even in its false contrasts of character and incident. With the mob it might even be an argument against certain crimes. Its descriptions of ideal family life are inviting, and the scenes of horror are painted with something like sincerity. Exaggeration and disproportion spoil all, however; and the determination that the new principle shall succeed in his work makes Zola's atheism and materialism far grosser than Swinburne's, although appealed to less often. The world knows that Zola failed, like Swinburne and Whitman, with his own generation. Few false prophets have received in their lifetime punishment as swift and effective: Swinburne missed the honors of laureate, which were nothing, but the contempt inspiring the slight was much; Whitman passed an old age honored and laughed at; Zola suffered a long agony of annihilation, and saw himself labeled by his own craft as an exhalation of the swamp. The form of the failure has to be taken into account. The three men proved clearly, for the literati as for the crowd, the uselessness of Naturalism as a substitute for the Christian principle. Something of their spirit remained, however, and Zola's postulate became the shibboleth of modern journalism: everything should be told. The postulate deceived the critics, attracted them, and held them for a time; they hailed the new star and with united breath held it in the sky; but when the decent described its true character and called in the police, they suddenly

withdrew both admiration and wind, and let the new star fall back into its native fen extinguished. Swinburne in his retirement must have felt the grim irony of fate in the rise of Whitman and Zola to illustrate broadly in caricature some consequences of his own principle, which he had refused to acknowledge: the merely ridiculous and the cheaply vile. It is well to bear in mind that their naturalism lives in some forms of journalism. In particular Zola may be sung by his admirers as the founder of that form which prints everything, without proportion or perspective, without decency, or taste, or even commercial discretion. One thing should not be forgotten in forming an estimate of the forces of Naturalism: its promoters sing, expound and write from experience, personal and otherwise. Their enthusiasm and other emotions spring less from principle and personal ambition than from actual contact with the pleasures of life as viewed by their kind. This is not considered important by the critics; but the critics close their eyes too often for their own glory. Most writers of the school of style-and-stench ought to be in jail part of the time; their latest representative, the Italian d'Annunzio, is said on good authority to have enjoyed the distinction. The failure of Naturalism, as compared with Pessimism, had considerable dignity; for authority set itself to digging sewers that the filth might flow swiftly and harmlessly into the ocean; whereas dry, correct, elegant Despair perished like a small puddle under a strong sun.

When men tire of false principles, they do not always turn again to the true. In this particular case the failure of Dirt and Despair turned them more positively towards negation. They had agreed that nothing could be got from Christ, that the doctrine of the eternal life with all its postulates and consequences had passed into dreamland. The leaders reasoned that even if such a life existed, even if God ruled in the universe, man could know nothing of these things. Then arose a principle: the Unknowable. Then followed the postulate: nothing should be said about it. And at once, from a mere weariness agnosticism became a positive thing; from a name it became an active principle; and now it is almost a cause to be fought for on bloody battle-fields. What a contrast with Zola's postulate, everything should be told, is the new declaration of dumbness. Yet there is nothing vague about it. Agnosticism, whatever it may be, is the third great and serious attempt to get rid of Christ in literature, and to find a working principle and a sure method in His place.

Its strength at the present moment is drawn from the political and social conditions of the time. The people without religion are now numbered by the millions. Their mental attitude towards religion is purely agnostic: it may be all right, but nobody can know;

and why bother about things unknowable? In consequence the science and the art of politics are now the study and the practice of running a government without God; the management of charitable institutions excludes the religious motive and religious people; the education of the child has been carefully divorced from Christian principle. It would be difficult to name a department of human activity into which the new principle has not wormed itself. Science ignores religion as a factor anywhere, and often treats it as an enemy; journalism is positively hostile in principle, though journalists be Christian; art in English-speaking countries it not merely indifferent, it is purely incapable, in portraying Christian scenes; and history, written from the agnostic point of view, denounces the expulsion of the Arabs from Spain and the Huguenots from France as of the same character, and has no sympathy for the Irish sold in the Barbadoes by Cromwell. One can easily imagine then the effect of the new principle on literature. It is best studied in shining examples.

The leading critics of the day, and the little mob who shout at their heels, have surrendered themselves to it; which accounts for the infinite variety and laughable stupidity of their daily blunders. They applauded Zola and worshiped Swinburne, as now they worship d'Annunzio. By reading steadily the publications in which they thrive one may learn of every literary abomination, or monster, or curiosity on earth, before hearing of Manzoni or Newman. Indeed, one of their finest achievements was the contemptuous ignoring of the great master of English prose, around 1880, while they blew their raucous horns in honor of the newly-discovered Zola. For a list of their remaining glories the student may be referred to the "*Ephemera Critica*" of John Churton Collins. Following the new principle that religion should be left to the conscience, the home, the temple, and should not intrude into the market-place or the academy, their agreement has been to ignore, condemn and destroy literary work of a religious kind. It is an axiom with them that, where religion steps in literary form steps out. This is not hostility, it is simply ignorance; nor is it the ignorance of accident, but of art. The critics are proud of their condition, which has deprived them of the respect and confidence of their natural clients. Even more curious is the effect of agnostic influences on the writing of men like Howells and Crawford. The novels of Mr. Howells have earned for him a wide and deserved esteem as moving examples of the literary art. They possess one singular defect. All admit that the novel is a transcript of actual life; and Mr. Howells is charged with the artistic fault of too great, too photographic fidelity to real life. His novels are concerned entirely with American life. The whole world knows that Christianity, either doc-

trinally or sentimentally, dominates the lives of our people at present; for they are usually married by a clergyman, die with his ministrations, and are buried in the churchyard. You will never discover any of these facts from Howells' novels. A foreigner, if he drew conclusions from them, would argue that religion was unknown to Americans. One would imagine that the novelist before publication carefully picked out from his stories all the chance expressions that hinted at the religious facts. His books are very fine illustrations of the postulate: nothing should be said about it. Mr. Howells may have no religious faith, but Mr. Crawford is a convert to Catholicity. His novels possess the same defect as Howells', though not so perfectly; they treat often of Italian life and character; but for all that Mr. Crawford has done one might take the whole Italian race for pagans. He has not the same point of view as Howells: he writes for his publishers as well as for his public. But what an injustice both writers do to Americans and Italians, what a failure in artistic power, by their peculiar surrender to a false and insufficient principle.

It is the crowning success of Agnosticism in letters, as in actual life, that in the war against The Christ it has enlisted on its side, not merely the enemies, but the friends of the Saviour: through ignorance or misapprehension, of course. Catholic writers have often submitted to its influence, as in the case of Crawford and others, but without any real need; for a false principle has only to be well fought in the open field to prove itself a weak and pretentious sham. However, for the moment agnostic literaryism is a great success, and, in spite of the signs of reaction, will rise to greater glory before its career comes to a miserable end. Like its predecessors, it is insufficient and repressive, and its horizon is too small. Neither its critics nor its imaginative writers will submit long to a limitation which shuts out from their view the genius of a writer like the Polish novelist, Sienkiewicz. The case of Cardinal Newman is not so much to the point, because national bigotry had its share in keeping his genius in the background. The literary principle of the Pole was aggressively Christian, and so much an instinctive part of his work that he himself could hardly escape it even with conscious purpose. The critics read him, sniffed the air of the obsolete and turned away haughtily. They might have felt the presence of such a magician as Scott, but they declined to accept as legitimate the results gained by adherence to an exploded principle of the literary art. The people forced them to recognize Sienkiewicz. The popularity of his books, even in translation, demanded an explanation, and his influence, growing daily, had to be measured officially. Hence the half-hearted, wholly incompetent reviews of the great

novelist's production. So far the explanation of him has not appeared, and the tape-line of the critics has not yet been lengthened sufficiently to suit his splendid proportions. Strangely enough, the great Longfellow suffered in the same manner, and suffers until this day from the incompetent criticism of the hour. Though he can hardly be called a Christian, Longfellow was so steeped in Christian sentiment, his ideals were so Christian, his literary taste was so instinctively hostile to the erratic and unclean, that his thoroughly Christian poetry became the mark of a criticism maggotty with doubt and despair. Evidently he found no inspiration in the principles which occupied the thought and work of so many of his contemporaries; and his reward has been the affectionate regard of another generation, which looks with indifference on the almost forgotten productions of the same contemporaries.

One may easily see from the very roughness of the outline given in this article how large a subject has been treated in a small space. All the proper shadings have been dispensed with, all the graceful colorings which charm, all the qualifying details so necessary to the artistic presentation of a subject. These would require a volume. However, the main facts are now in full view. Every one knows how wide and deep have been the influences of our greatest and most successful writers; of Arnold, George Eliot, Emerson, Swinburne, Whitman, Howells and others mentioned above; and from that width and depth we can at least guess at the fearful hold upon men taken by the principles from which they worked, principles always antagonistic to Christ, and always helpful to some form of error. Is it cause for wonder that after fifty years of Dirt, Doubt and Despair there should be a decline in literary production, and confusion in the literary world? The wonder is that literature escaped complete ruin. The critics are still discussing the decadence and the confusion in exquisite phrase, substantial as a lady's perfume. They might consider with profit the dictum: he that is not with Me is against Me, and he that gathereth not with Me scattereth.

JOHN TALBOT SMITH.

New York.

THE SOCIAL BEARING OF ELEMENTARY INSTRUCTION.

A PART from the moral problem in elementary instruction, there is another of the purely economic social order. The moral problem, namely, how to introduce some instruction concerning the only basis of morality, will not be solved otherwise than by a sincere, unanimous, public, effective recognition of the truth that morality cannot be taught without religion. In the past five years, under the overpowering demonstration of events, voluntary testimonies to this truth have been coming fast, one upon another, even from sources whence we had hardly hoped to look for them. However, this recognition is not effective; it is not productive of results; and it does not promise anything. It comes to us more like the cry of horror at the spectre of the future seen through the transparent facts of the present. Like many other unheeded forebodings, it may be destined to stand merely as a prophetic warning to point back to when the day of reckoning is over. Most often the one who dares to speak a warning is not among those who have remedial power; and too often those who have remedial power reckon not of anything but their own personal transient advantage. Thus, often enough, reform movements become theatrical, spectacular, directed to the deception of the multitude—to the pruning away and disinfecting of certain over noisome fruits, rather than to the eradicating of deep-seated and ever fruitful causes. Here is the history of human calamity read between the lines: the echo of pleading voices, fallen as the idle wind upon the ears of those who have dominated dread situations.

But we ventured to assert that there is an economic problem in the matter of elementary instruction. From the latest report of the United States Commissioner of Education, that is, for the school year 1900-1801, we gather that in the sum of all the educational institutions in the United States there is a total attendance of almost exactly seventeen and one-quarter million students. Eliminating the distinction which is made in the report between public and private schools, and making a computation on the basis of grade and specific purpose, we shall find this fifth part of our national population to be distributed as follows:

Elementary Schools	15,856,330
Secondary Schools	856,227
Universities and Colleges	103,251
Professional Schools	55,089
Normal Schools	68,380
City Night Schools	185,000
Business Schools	70,686
Kindergartens	93,737
Indian Schools	23,500

Schools for Defectives	23,601
Reform Schools	24,925
Orphan and other Benevolent.....	14,000
Schools in Alaska	1,369
Miscellaneous	50,000

Excluding Night Schools, Business Schools, Reform Schools, Asylums, etc., we wish to speak solely of the class that stands at the head of the list, the Elementary Schools. These include what we understand strictly by the name of Ward or District or Parish Grammar or Primary Schools which go directly before the High School. In them we have an attendance of 15,856,330 out of a total student population in all the establishments of 17,225,095. That is to say, they are attended by fifteen and four-fifths millions out of seventeen and a quarter. To use whole numbers: out of every sixty-nine in the total student population there are sixty-three in the elementary school. So that we are perfectly safe in saying that there are fifteen out of seventeen million students who do not get beyond the elementary school, the district and the parish school.

It is conceded by eminent educators that connected with the elementary instruction there is a certain problem which is still awaiting a solution. The editor of the *Educational Review* (Feb., 1902) remarks: "The grammar school curriculum is now the burning question in public school discussions. The more it is discussed, the more will the necessity of reform be made apparent." Professor Dewey, writing in the same *Review* (June, 1901), says that the people will not be slow to provide equipment and resources "when the educators have come to some agreement as to what education is." He says that we have been going through a period of "blind experimentation," of "blind striving," and he continues: "I believe we are now nearing the close of the time of tentative, blind, empirical experimentation; that we are close to the opportunity of planning our work on the basis of a coherent philosophy of experience and of the relation of school studies to that experience." This is, at least, the expression of a belief that we are close to the opportunity of making a plan on the basis of something coherent.

At the meeting of the Massachusetts Superintendents' Association, 1901, Mr. James P. Munroe, of Boston, in presenting his personal estimate of our blind experimentations, said: "Many of the new methods, on the contrary—methods of gently cooing towards a child's inclinations, of timidly placing a chair for him before a disordered banquet of heterogeneous studies—may produce lady-like persons, but they will not produce men. And when these modern methods go so far as to compel the teacher to divide this intellectual cake and pudding into convenient morsels and to spoon-feed them to the child—partly in obedience to his scholarly cravings,

partly in conformity with a pedagogical diet-list dictated by the latest outgivings of physiological psychology—then the result is sure to be intellectual and moral dyspepsia in a race of milksops.

"It is the tritest of saying that there is no royal road to learning; but too many of the modern methods ignore this truism, or, rather, seem to believe that the road can be traveled vicariously by the teacher, who, working to the uttermost edge of her nerves, must perform prodigious intellectual journeys in order to spare a few steps of wholesome drudgery to the unwisely cosseted pupils.

"Nobody else in the world works harder than a baby, and none accomplishes more in the same period of time. The baby, it is true, has the several great advantages that his relatives do not appreciate how hard he is laboring, that he would not understand them even were they to commiserate him, and that he is compelled by nature to do one thing—or, at most, a few things—at a time; devoting himself to just those tasks, without any distraction from without.

"One is now considered to be frightfully behind the times if he attempts to teach the multiplication table and similar things seemingly fundamental to ordinary knowledge; but is it quite right to spare the child these disagreeable labors now if, in doing so, there is laid up for him a store of future trouble because of his ignorance of these memorized facts? . . . The New Education is in danger of providing too much atmosphere and too little training."

President Andrew S. Draper (University of Illinois), in a paper prepared for the Harvard Teachers' Association (1902), said: "'Culture' has been the slogan of recent years. It is important, but strength is still more important. It is very desirable, but it is yet more desirable that boys shall be trained to bear the part of a real man, and girls the part of a real woman. If they are, the culture will come with it.

"We have many of us forced our particular schemes into the work of the elementary school until we have constructed an incoherent and unsymmetrical whole. We have overlooked the fact that it makes not so much matter how much work a child does as that he shall do something exactly and completely, have the satisfaction of accomplishing difficult tasks, and gain the enthusiasm for yet more difficult ones.

"We have shaped the work of the lower schools with too much reference to the demands of the advanced schools.

"We have changed and multiplied the branches taught in the schools until they confuse and confound the homes upon which the great public educational system rests. Parents are unable to enter into the work of their children. It is not because the parents are

so ignorant, but because the work is so changed and complex. There is something sad about this, and there is something more than sad, even dangerous, about it. It lessens the interest of the people in the schools."

And Dr. E. Benjamin Andrews (University of Nebraska) writes (*Educational Review*, March, 1901): "Closely connected with the pupils' dislike for solid reading is the evident disinclination of too many boys and girls after leaving school to make earnest effort of any kind. They have not the power of strong execution. They lack courage, resolution, 'sand.' They are afraid to take the initiative. The typical pupil of to-day must be interested before he can act. The pedagogy of gush has brought him to look to his teacher for interest, not to find it in himself. It is beaten into his head that his teacher must keep him attentive. If a suggested task is not interesting, he cannot think of it as having any claims upon him. Little of the tonic that comes from driving the will to perform unpleasant duties is ever given him."

It will not do for us to make assertions in this matter. Hence we have felt obliged to bring in testimony. We have tried to make it short, and have taken it from but a very few of many respectable witnesses who might have been cited to the same purpose. The purpose has been solely to indicate that there is an expressed recognition of the existence of some kind of an unsolved problem attaching to the elementary instruction. We must ask indulgence, now, for a longer citation, coming as a summary and as an authentic verdict from another competent authority.

In the annual meeting of the Department of Superintendence of the National Educational Association held at Chicago last February, Dr. Paul H. Hanus, Professor of the theory and practice of education, Harvard University, read the opening paper. His subject was: "Obstacles to Educational Progress." He limited himself to the discussion of school programmes. He said by way of introduction: "The recent history of attempted reform in school programmes is quickly told. About twenty years ago the elementary school programme, with its narrow content and overwhelming emphasis on the school arts—reading, writing, arithmetic, and English grammar—was seen to be inadequate and formal. It provided some acquaintance with the school arts themselves, but afforded little real education. It prepared for an elementary education, but did not furnish it.

"Accordingly, rather more than ten years ago, we began to increase the scope of the elementary school programmes. We sought to improve them by 'enrichment.' To the school arts the formal studies, we added 'thought studies'—literature, history, nature study,

and an improved geography. To the narrow field of the traditional arithmetic we added elementary algebra and geometry; we laid more stress on the drawing, music, and physical training already represented in the schools' occupation; and we introduced manual training, and occasionally a foreign language. But the result was far from satisfactory. We had become convinced that enrichment was necessary, and had acted on our conviction. But the enrichment had involved us in new difficulties that proved to be formidable obstacles to progress. Our programmes were congested, especially in those portions of the new programmes most affected by enrichment—the earliest and the latest pre-high-school grades. The middle ground was and remains, justly, I think, though perhaps not always intentionally, the territory where the school arts are supreme.

"Then it seemed that the elimination of 'non-essentials' from the old programmes would solve our difficulties. Such elimination, it was asserted, must precede and accompany enrichment—which was true; and it was also announced, with something of a flourish and a good deal of insistence, that 'correlation' would accomplish the rest. Correlation was interpreted to mean such a grouping of the subject-matter that each study could and should be so pursued as to cover, incidentally, adequate instruction in others." Dr. Hanus then refers to a committee which was appointed in 1893, and says: "It was understood that one of the committee's most important duties should be to set forth, clearly and in detail, to what extent the problem of our programme difficulties could be solved by correlation." And he adds: "This important study is still awaiting the leisure and inclination of broad-minded students, willing and able to devote a long period of time to it.

"By this time," he continues, "we had attempted 'enrichment,' 'elimination' and 'correlation;,' this had effected a more or less thorough-going revision of the programme of elementary studies from beginning to end; and the result was *chaos*. There is no better term to describe the infinite variety, complexity, and instability that resulted from the successive tinkerings to which the elementary programmes had been subjected. And chaotic they remain. But it is no longer a discouraging situation. Before this stage had been reached, we had gradually come to see that what we needed was guiding principles."

The independent judgments of the two very distinguished Professors of Education coincide with such precision in the characterization of a fact. With the one, we acknowledge that for so many long years we have been working without guiding principles; and with the other, that the period in question has been one of blind, tentative experimentation. But what have we been looking for?

Education, of course. We made the discovery that the traditional studies did not educate. Therefore, we begin to enrich, to eliminate, etc., until we got into chaos—where we now are. But why did we not go straight to the mark? Ah, there was the difficulty. Have we not just heard one of the Professors putting this very condition, “when the educators have come to some agreement as to what education is!” You ask, why we do not hold a meeting. We did. That is where the trouble began. We have got too many ideas and cannot carry them out. Our speculations are much directed towards enhancing our neighbor’s efficiency; our activity is expended in making an ever-changing composite from the indefinite succession of ideals proposed to us. Truly, one might be tempted in the present conjuncture to inquire whether it would not be wise to interdict all educational conference for a term of years, to throw the teachers back upon their own thoughts for execution, and to leave them to make such impression upon the pupils as they might under the stimulus of their own originality and their own natural mental growth.

The condition referred to by the two eminent Pedagogists is not the affliction of isolated localities, nor is it confined to any one kind of schools. The wave of the blind tentative has swept over the elementary schools from ocean to ocean. Public, private, parish, ward, district, select schools of the elementary class—all, with few exceptions, have been either directly affected or indirectly influenced. There has been, throughout, a vague, pervading fear of being behind the times, of not being in the “swim,” and the volume of the wave has been kept copiously supplied from the inexhaustible reservoirs of the vigilant book companies, *et al.* We have changed our books, we have changed our subjects, we have changed our methods. When book and subject and method did not respond magically to our first touch, like the key of a type-writer, and give us the happy result, we betook ourselves, forthwith, to the catalogues of the publishers. And there we found subjects innumerable, and histories and grammars and geographies by the page-full, and a dozen new and infallible methods to try—all of which we introduced one after the other hopefully into our test in expectation of the elusive precipitate, education.

Education! What is it? It is something co-extensive with human capability—with the development, training, cultivation of the sum total of human power. It is something as wide in its objective reach as the field of human activity. From this it follows that when we come to speak of the concrete, of the actual or even possible education of a determinate individual, it is necessary for us to specify. For, no individual, under no matter what training, can arrive at a

high development of absolutely every capability which he possesses. When, therefore, we wish to determine what kind of education is to be given to an individual, it would seem to be wise for us to follow in this the very plain rule which by instinct we follow in everything else, namely, the rule of *looking to the end*. Again, when the education of one person is assumed by another (and the education of the child is always assumed by somebody) said person has a right to be provided with such education as may be a real need to himself and to the community in which he is naturally destined to dwell. Thus every one whose education is assumed by another has a right to a moral education based upon the true grounds of conscientious obligation. In these pages we are not speaking of moral instruction, nor of the groundwork of religion necessary to bring that instruction into voluntary exercise. We are speaking 1, of the elementary school; 2, of the curriculum in the elementary school, apart from instruction in morality and religion, and apart from the question of school management or school discipline. We are looking directly at the matter, and indirectly at the method of secular studies in the elementary school. Is this matter, is the elementary school programme, curriculum, schedule of studies what it ought to be? Is there any criterion by which to judge what it ought to be? Is there any possibility of making it what it ought to be? We naturally look to the end. What does the programme aim at? and what should it aim at? Is there any particular result it ought to have in view? First of all, is there any particular need of individuals and of society for the supplying of which individuals and society have a strict right to look to the programme? Can the programme, as constructed, supply this need? Does the programme, as conducted, supply this need? And if not, why not? In the purely temporal and social order there is just one such need—both dominant and predominant. It is that the fifteen out of seventeen million students, the fifteen millions who never get beyond the elementary school, be so instructed, developed and trained that when they go forth from the elementary school they may be capable of accepting their natural opportunities in society. By natural opportunities we must understand those which ought to be theirs in view of the social conditions they shall have to face; and which can be made theirs by what it is possible to give them in the limited term of their schooling. Here is something tangible, feasible, a situation which is an ever present reality, a demand for only the most reasonable possibilities.

We have heard some testimony from the inside. It might be asked, what is the impression on the outside. One who should put himself to the task of a fair inquiry would learn this much: that there is a complaint. It is not always very definite in its discrimina-

tion of matters and methods. Still it is a complaint; and it is very widespread. Very often educators are afforded subject for innocent amusement by the character of the grievances which are brought to them, when people demand of the school things which the school cannot be expected to do. However, the complaints that come up from those who have gone out from the elementary school and from their parents may not be all ill-founded. They are not expressed in pedagogical terminology. They are not formulated with a power of analysis and generalization. But, taken all in all, they are expressive of a disappointment which arises when the product of seven or eight years of schooling is set face to face with life in those very surroundings for which his schooling might reasonably have been supposed to be preparing him. The case, as it stands vaguely in the minds of these people, is this: that they have placed implicit confidence in the school, and just at the moment when the situation is beyond repair they find that they have been disappointed. And the reply that is made to them is not always most consoling or reassuring. We challenge them to tell us what do they want; and they are not able to answer us in pedagogical jargon. In this connection we have to notice the two apparently opposite phenomena: universal popular belief in the school, and well nigh universal popular censure for the school. But the belief transcends the condemnation. There is a firm conviction with the people that it is possible to get a certain something out of the school, and they keep on in the hope that this possibility may be realized. They are like men who are convinced that there is gold in the mine, and who keep on buying stock and paying assessments in the hope that in their day the gold may be forthcoming. So also the people feel they need precisely what they think the school can give them; they see no way of getting this needful thing except through the school; and they hold on to the school.

After taking all the testimony from the parties directly interested on the inside and on the outside, and after collating all that has been said from each exclusive point of view, we shall still find ourselves with a very indefinite case on hand. But there is another view. It is to be had from the standpoint of the well educated man who is not an educator, but upon whom the members of the fifteen million may have to be dependent when they first enter the ranks of the wage-earners. It may be lawful to state how the importance of this view came to be fully recognized by the writer. By reason of special circumstances, during the course of twelve or fourteen years covering precisely this period of chaos and blind experimentation, the writer came to be mixed up outside of the class room with the boys of the fifteen million who had received the elementary schooling and nothing more, and who were to get nothing more. From the char-

acter of his associations with them it soon became evident that one of the most important and most immediately urgent necessary services to be rendered to these boys was to get them something to do. The result was the establishment of a complete bureau of information for their benefit. The writer's connection with these boys was in two large and busy commercial and industrial centres, aggregating at least two million people, or the fortieth part of our total population. The field might be counted a favorable one from which to reckon the average of observation. And the observation was this, namely, that the boys were not fitted by their elementary schooling for actual life. We do not mean by this that they were not sent out consummate financiers and book-keepers and traveling agents and skilled mechanics; but, that they were not possessed of the necessary foundations upon which to build and advance themselves even though they came with the best will and fell upon the best opportunities. What was lacking? Certain definite information and training, essential to their advancement, which could have been provided in the elementary school, but which had been overlooked in the experimentation and crowded out by things not so essential to their future prospects.

And what are these essentials? If the mention of them may seem hardly becoming the dignity of a *Quarterly Review*, our apology is that they are the prime factors in a very grave social problem. And we have this specific problem very much for the reason that these plain things have been ignored as not being magnificent enough to adorn psychological dissertations on the child, *a priori* rhapsodies on the pedagogic ideal, and cumulative advertising of the *ego*. We are speaking here of the boys. The girls' side of the question might form a problem of itself. We state the question again. We are speaking of a very definite means to a definite end. We are limiting our view to pure instruction in the elementary school, as fitting the boy of the fifteen millions to accept his future opportunities. In the matter of instruction as we have seen the case the essentials are *number* and *expression*. In the manner of imparting this instruction there is one habit which the teacher should continuously aim at forming in the pupil, the habit of *work*.

Of *number* we have this to say, that no good reason can be assigned why an ordinary boy going from the elementary school should not be thoroughly versed in all the common business computations. It is possible for such a boy to arrive at a certain immediate readiness with numbers. Being a possibility it is his right. It is one of the conditions of his future advancement. The boy that has it is both noted and promoted. It shows itself very soon in his conversation with his employer. The boy has the field of number spread out

before him. He has learned the relations of special numbers. He knows his multiplication table; and perhaps he knows it up to twenty-five. He can add off-hand any two numbers under one hundred—and that means any numbers. He has ready answers without being obliged to have recourse in small matters to the artificial processes of the pencil. In short, he can do the better work; and he gets it to do. We may be told, "Let the boys go, later on, to a business school or to a night school." We would not object to their going to these schools. We should like to see them put in six or eight months or a year at these schools. But the boys belong to a class that has quit school and cannot be gotten to go to school. In the business and night schools together we have one-quarter of a million of students. In this other class we have fifteen millions and three-quarters. In fact, we are trying to present the case as mildly as possible; for it is much more desperate than we are making it. We are presuming that all the boys of the fifteen millions finish the seventh and eighth grade. But it would perhaps not be overstepping the mark to say that one-half of them do not enter the sixth grade. Still we are presuming that all pass through the eighth grade in order to present a plea for those at least who get it.

Secondly, *expression*. By this we mean both written and oral expression: language and the use of it, as broadly understood. There it is: number, speech and writing. This looks like prescribing the three R's. But it is something more. For by written expression we do not mean merely legible handwriting, but the power of putting down in writing those things which the boy may have clearly in his own mind. Here again, no legitimate reason can be given why the power of correct expression cannot be acquired in the elementary school. We take the liberty of hinting at one possible result in the line of written expression. The boy can, and to meet his opportunities in the present conditions of society, he should learn everything connected with the writing of a letter: forms of address, subscription, superscription, forms for various occasions, folding, etc. A well digested little book on letter writing would be one of the *most* valuable books that could be put into the course in the place of something that is not necessary. It would be a treasure which the boy would keep, and which he would often have occasion to consult in after years. There should be nothing connected with notes and letters which the boy might not know. He can learn it all, if it is presented to him, if the teacher knows it—a condition which it not unfrequently wanting. Many and many a time the boy's progress in life will depend upon this one matter, even upon the answering of an invitation, or a note of thanks or a letter of condolence. If a boy comes to me, looking for a place, I give him pen and paper, and tell

him to write his own application. If he cannot do this it may be, of course, because he is exceptionally dull. But if we discover from other circumstances that he is ordinarily bright, then we have to confess humbly that he has not been fairly dealt with: for he might have learned to do it in the time which he has been forced to spend at not learning a dozen other things. He has been systematically defrauded of his opportunities.

Expression embraces also and particularly oral expression and whatever can be put under the heading of self-presentation and address. For instance, there is the study of pronunciation. To teach it properly, the teachers themselves should be skilled orthoepists. How many are? Do we not observe that it is common for a class that has been under a teacher who is well versed in pronunciation, to exhibit an unusual readiness in speech and to be provided with an abundant vocabulary. The reason of this is very simple and natural: the children have become accustomed to the rich vocabulary. They have gathered the true significance of new words from the context as addressed to themselves, and they are not afraid to use them. Nine times out of ten a boy's future will depend upon his address; his address will depend upon his vocabulary; and his vocabulary will be conditioned by his security in pronunciation. One must look out into the broad field of educational influences to see the serious consequences which the presence or absence of the habit of correct spelling and pronunciation has upon the after-life of the pupil. The boy who is not sure of his pronunciation must be hesitant in his speech and limited in his vocabulary through fear of mispronouncing, unless he can have recourse to slang. He who is not sure of his spelling will write few and short letters and will be afraid to attempt those which would be the key to his advancement. And who does not know that readiness in epistolary correspondence and uniformly correct pronunciation, besides being for him his best introduction to a better place and a higher salary, are at the same time amongst the most desirable, the most highly appreciated, and the most serviceable of the polite accomplishments. Given, the boy who is ready with his numbers, who can express himself in complete—not broken—sentences, with a correct pronunciation, who can put on paper, grammatically, his own clear thoughts, and we can always find for him a position from which he can rise.

But there is a *proviso*. And the proviso is that whilst being instructed in the essentials he is also formed to the habit of wholesome labor, such mental labor as the child's constitution will endure and profit by. This labor will not necessarily imply that the boy carries home a stack of books every evening. It will mean more strictly that he tries to carry home *some* knowledge in the evening and to

bring back *some more* in the morning. We speak of a habit of labor. The elementary school that does not look to the formation of this habit is a dangerous thing. It is through repetitions of act that habit is naturally acquired. It is only through the frequent application to actual work that one can acquire the habit of work; and by this we mean the readiness of setting oneself to the accomplishment of a task that cannot be labelled "fun." Moreover, it is only by seeing the results of work that one can learn practically not to look for results until the proportionate work shall have been done. Furthermore, it is in the results of work that we find the stimulus for a new undertaking. Finally, it is from the memories of experience and from the outlook of a wider horizon gained by personal endeavor that one conceives of new enterprises and has the courage to attempt them. There is a grave social danger in a habit of mind which will make a people always on the lookout for their masters to do something for them. The mind which, so to say, has been always surfeited and carried and has not been made self-reliant by the sheer test of its strength against new and growing burdens, is fostered to a most undesirable spirit of tutelage. When the hard problem of life comes so early to the masses—the problem of bread, the problem of a home, the problem of support for the dependent, the problem of caste in society—then the spirit that has not been trained to the habit of work, is in imminent danger of passing to one or another of the extremes, namely, of rebelling against the whole order of society, or of settling down morbidly to life-work as to a slavery, a fatality from which it sees a release only in the grave.

Persons who have been out of the school for twenty years and who have not paid particular attention to the developments that have been going on in the class-room, may well look at us in unbelieving wonder when we tell them of some of the things we are doing or trying to do. Outside of the educators, comparatively few persons have taken in the full significance of a fact which is referred to in the following words (April, 1902) by Mr. William Warner Bishop, of the Polytechnic Institute, Brooklyn, New York: "At a recent meeting of the Long Island Library Club a question was raised which, it seems to me, is of some concern to students of our educational programmes. The president of the club started a most interesting discussion by asking the assembled librarians if they had discovered any general lack of acquaintance with the order of the letters of the alphabet among children. An almost unanimous affirmative was given, and a series of anecdotes was told to illustrate the very general difficulty experienced, not alone in the use of a card catalogue—which is ever a mystery to some souls—but even in the use of dictionaries and encyclopædias. Moreover—and this is the point which

I wish to bring to the attention of teachers—librarians who have for years been dealing with children, especially those in charge of ‘childrens rooms,’ affirmed that ignorance of alphabetical order is more noticeable of late than in former years. We have recently heard many and loud complaints that college freshmen can’t spell; here comes an affirmative from competent observers that pupils in our grammar and high schools don’t know their letters. . . . In view of the immensely important rôle played by the alphabet in most systems and schemes of arrangement, it would be well for those who supervise educational programmes to ask themselves whether they provide in them some place where children are taught thoroughly their A B C’S. . . . Every filing system, dictionary, encyclopædia, catalogue, bibliography, and almost every sort of list has as its basis and key the alphabet. The difficulties to which I am calling attention have been reported in the case of very simple and elementary catalogues, dictionaries, and large-print reference books.” We are not called upon here to go into this kind of detail, but we have thought it well to give this single instance in order to put but one question, which will serve as an illustration taken from our practical point of view. What happens to the lad from the elementary school for whom we get a position as office boy, but who does not know habitually the order of the letters in the alphabet? He is soon dismissed. He has things in disorder; or he is so slow that nobody in the office can wait for him. He is not able to follow any classification, whether of goods, towns or customers. Everything is unchangeably committed to the alphabetical order. The business has to move. It cannot wait for the boy. So he is discharged. He has lost his first and his best place, the place where he had a chance to make his record. Now, when he goes place-hunting, his only recommendation will be that he has been discharged as incompetent. Of what avail, then, is it, from this point of view, to have those long essays and lectures on the “scientific, literary and æsthetic correlation of school to life,” when the life that is pictured is not the one that the fifteen millions will have to face when they go out from school; when it is the life of culture and ease that will never be theirs unless they afterwards win their way to it; and when they will never be able to win their way to it so long as they are deprived by their education of the possibility of making a start?

Perhaps the man who is acquainted with instruction only is not the best qualified to correlate elementary instruction to life. Dealing always with instructors of ascending and descending grades, he falls instinctively into the (in this case) disadvantage of the man looking through a telescope. He looks through the elementary school into the academy, high school or preparatory college. He

looks through the college into the university; and through the university into the professions. He looks through one tube into another; and right at the start he has the whole surrounding world shut off from view by the walls of his tube. And it is precisely this surrounding world that he ought to take account of; and not the greater or lesser magnitude of those professional stars away off in the depths of the future. He works in the dark; and the darker it is, the better for his work. What he needs to do is to throw away his telescope; to go out into the sunlight; to move with open eyes and open ears amid the seething millions of human beings; to bring with him a mind open to conviction, and a heart open to the sadness of the life of millions, whose life has been made sad because they have been hindered from the possibility of seizing their natural opportunities. In general the people have been told for twelve years, "leave the matter to the experts." They have left it to the experts and—let us confess it humbly—the experts have failed. The people are now told that we must have time; that we must evolve something; that we must study the correlation of the school to life. Does that mean that we must put a new section on our telescope? From the outlook it would seem that the new series of experiments is going to be only a little more disastrous than the old. Men of education to whom our elementary school boys may look for employment, men engaged in banking, railways, industrial and commercial enterprises, in practical philanthropic work, would, were we to consult them, tell us something about the essentials which we might not discover by looking through our telescopes for the rest of the century.

What we are anxious for is simply this, that the fifteen millions be given the chance they ought to have. We have in our power the making of the conditions upon which it will be possible for many of them to rise. Without these conditions it will be impossible—barring the very rare exception—for any of them to rise. We are not affirming that they are all to take the first place; but we do not wish to see them excluded from the tenth and the twentieth place where the opportunities are multiplied by the hundred and the thousand. Concrete education must meet the concrete and inevitable life. Education is a misnomer for the instruction and training that send out a vast population which must necessarily sink until it forms a solid lowest substratum of society; a vast population which before the age of thirty learns that it can never be more than this substratum. The result is a social menace when this population becomes class-conscious of an injury that has been inflicted upon it by those whom it trusted, seeing that if its members had been provided with an essential groundwork upon which to educate themselves, it might have sent up half a dozen men of native intelligence and leader-

ship, of brains and energy, to compete by hard work with every man who came out fortified even with the advantages of a diploma. In our present conditions we find that the boy from the parish or district grammar school, if he has an idea of advancement, finds himself in competition with the boy from the high school and the academy, and even with the college graduate. It is the fifteen millions facing the one million : 15 to 1. The high school or college student says he is willing to take anything to get a start. And he is the one who gets the start. Among the fifteen you may find many who are naturally his intellectual superiors. But he has an immediate preparation which they have not ; and they have not the groundwork upon which to prepare themselves for a future opportunity. Thus it comes to pass that the eligible positions fall continuously into the hands of those who need them least ; whilst those who need them most are relegated to a class-wage, with little or no hope of ever rising above a precarious Saturday pay-roll. So that whilst we are scorning the class distinction of a titled aristocracy, we are creating, have created a worse money-mind distinction and have furrowed its trench lines deep across our social system.

The character then of the instruction which the boys of the fifteen million need and which they have a right to, is a very definite thing. It is so definite, so patent, so single, so universal as a groundwork, that the surprise is how we could have been so successful in shutting our eyes to it. This instruction, too, should be planned in such a way that the boy who leaves school after fifth or sixth grade (as perhaps one-half do) shall be carried as far in essentials as it is possible to carry him by that time. Up to that stage non-essentials should be cut away to the last limit, and thrown back to seventh and eighth grade, if there be time for them even then. If we will not do this, if we will be obstinate in our fantastic theories, if we will insist upon precluding the boy from his chances, we shall have ourselves to blame when we hear his sad refrain, "No use, no use!" and we may put it to our own consciences when we see him settle down doggedly to a daily wage, to do as little as he can for it, and gradually to gravitate until, at the dawn of manhood, he is locked in the embrace of the great discontented. There is, therefore, a grave social problem involved in and dependent upon the working of the elementary school. The problem is how most rapidly to relieve a peculiar strain which cannot be accounted for or remedied by the economist's theories of capital and labor, work and wages, supply and demand. There is question of equalizing this strain by encouraging the expansion of forces inherent in the individual ; of restoring a disturbed equilibrium by opening the avenues to a healthy competition on a common ground of essential preparation, where native

intelligence, backed by industry and perseverance may see a chance of winning in the long run from even the holder of a diploma.

W. POLAND, S. J.

St. Louis, Mo.

ANCIENT COMMERCE WITH EAST AFRICA AND THE "OPHIR" OF KING SOLOMON.

WHAT mines supplied the gold for Solomon's Temple? It is curious that the tradition of ages has been silent on this point, and that until recently there have been scarcely more attempts on the part of archæologists to settle the question than to determine the much more shadowy one of the site of the Garden of Eden. It has been known that the carrying trade of the world used to be in the hands of the Phœnicians and Arabs, who brought most of the gold to Jerusalem, while from very remote times there have been rumors of gold-workings in the hinterland, of which Sofala was the port. Throughout a large tract of country, westward of the Sabi river, extensive ruins of well-built stone erections were found, the largest being at Zimbabwe, about twenty degrees latitude south, twelve miles from Fort Victoria. They consist of a combined temple and fortress on a granite hill, and other buildings of elliptic shape on the adjacent plains, with walls from 16 to 35 feet high, enclosing large and small stone towers, and other crumbling ruins in their vicinity. The earliest record of them is 1505 A. D., when the Portuguese traders at Sofala heard of their existence from the Arabs at that port, but no attempt was made to explore them till in 1871 Karl Mauch, a German explorer, discovered them whilst traveling between the Limpopo and Zambesi rivers. In 1891 they were carefully examined by Mr. J. T. Bent, who published the result of his investigations in a book called "The Ruined Cities of Mashonaland;" and recently by R. Hall and W. G. Neal, who published in the present year their results in "The Ancient Ruins of Rhodesia." The hill fortress of Zimbabwe, approached by a narrow, steep ascent, was adorned by monoliths, small round towers and pedestals of steatic rock, some of the latter adorned with carved figures of birds, of the raven, hawk or vulture form, sacred to the gods they symbolized. Here were found fragments of soap-stone bowls, with different animals, the human figure and other ornamentations carved upon them. We will give some reasons which seem to show that King Solomon must have obtained most

of his gold from this country, and this view will be confirmed, if we can show that most of the gold of Egypt and Arabia was obtained there many centuries before the era of Solomon.

THE BUILDERS OF THESE TEMPLE-FORTRESSES.

From what country came the builders of these mysterious ruins? According to Mr. Bent, whose opinion is confirmed by Messrs. Hall and Neal, and Professor Keane, "the balance of probabilities seems to be in favor of this country being South Arabia, and when it and Abyssinia are better known, we may find temples which are built of similar small stones, and with similar mathematical peculiarities in their construction. . . . Some of these buildings, which are known in Yemen, which seem to combine temple and fortress in one, as on Zimbabwe hill, may have been built by the same race that constructed Zimbabwe, and the elliptic temples at Marib and Suivah, and the one at Nakab-al-Hajar, with its north and south doorways seeming to indicate an observation of the meridian, may embody some of the mathematical principles illustrated by the ruins of Mashonaland."¹ Most authorities agree that the builders of these ruins, who worked the gold mines there, were of Arabian origin, probably before the Sabaeo-Himyaritic period, who came into contact with Egypt and Phœnicia, penetrating into countries unknown to the rest of the world. This is confirmed by a comparison with the ancient Egyptian gold mines. "An interesting parallel to the ancient gold-workings of Mashonaland is to be found by studying the account of the ancient gold-workings at the Egyptian gold mines in Wadi Allaga, given us by Diodorus. There, too, the gold was extracted from the quartz by a process of crushing and washing, as we can see depicted in the paintings on the Egyptian tombs, and in any gold-producing quarter of Mashonaland, near old shafts and by the side of streams, innumerable crushing-stones are still to be seen, used anciently for a like purpose, when slave-labor was employed. . . . From [Diodorus'] account it is obvious that the process employed by the ancient Egyptians for crushing, smelting and forming into ingots was exactly the same as that employed by the ancient inhabitants of Zimbabwe, which fact, together with the vast amount of evidence of ancient cult, ancient construction and ancient art, is, I think, conclusive that the gold fields of Mashonaland formed one at least of the sources from which came the gold of Arabia, and that the forts and towns which ran up the whole length of this gold-producing country were made to protect their men engaged in this industry."²

¹ "Ruined Cities of Mashonaland," Chapter V.

² "Ruined Cities of Mashonaland," Chap. VI.

³ Ezekiel, xxvii., 21, 22.

The Bible is full of allusions to the wealth of Arabia in gold and other things. Ezekiel¹⁸ tells us that the Sabaeans were merchants in gold for the markets of Tyre. "Arabia, and all the princes of Cedar, they were the merchants of thy land. The sellers of Saba and Reema, they were thy merchants; with all the best spices, and precious stones, and gold, which they set forth in thy market." According to Aristaeus, a large quantity of spices, gems and gold was brought to Rome not from Arabia, but by the Arabs. All travelers in Arabia say that little or no gold could have come from the Arabian peninsula itself; hence, the Zimbabwe country must almost certainly have been one of the spots whence came the "*Thesaurus Arabum*." Egyptian monuments also point to the wealth of the people of the Punt; whence did they get the large supply of gold, which they poured into Egypt and the then known world? In Mashonaland we seem to have a direct answer to this question. The Egyptians themselves would appear never to have carried their commerce outside the straits of Bab-el-Mandeb, but to have met at the port of Adule, in the south of the Red Sea, Arabian merchants who did so. Assyrian inscriptions record that, in the time of Solomon at least, Arabian commerce extended as far north as Nineveh, while southward it spread to Egypt, Abyssinia and the east coast of Africa. There is hence little doubt that the builders of Zimbabwe came from Arabia in the unchronicled centuries long before the Christian era.

WHERE WAS THE LAND OF PUNT SITUATED?

A long interval of time must have elapsed between the building of these fortresses and the expedition which Solomon sent to Ophir in quest of gold, 1100 B. C. Before we endeavor to settle the probable locality of Ophir, it will be useful to gather from contemporary records whatever will throw light on Arabian commerce and trade routes during this period. Besides the notices found in the Bible, Egyptian monuments furnish several important references to commerce with East Africa, which seem to confirm the theory that Solomon obtained his gold from Zimbabwe—the place from which gold was generally brought at the time of his expedition. On Egyptian monuments frequent mention is made of *Tanetar*, and *Punt*. Adolph Erman, the great German Egyptologist, says: "With these names they did not connect any very definite meaning; they were general terms, such as commerce introduces, terms like 'the Levant,' etc., with us. *Ta-neter* (the land of the gods) denoted . . . north and middle Arabia; *Punt* signified the more tropical shores of the Red Sea and the Somali

coast."⁴ To settle the position of Punt is important, as Egyptian monuments mention several expeditions which brought back much gold and incense from this land. King Sankhara, of the XI. Dynasty (circ. 2800 B. C.), sent his treasurer, Hena, to Punt. An inscription in the stone quarries of Hammamât tells us: "His majesty sent me to travel by sea to Punt, to bring fresh incense from the princes, the chieftains of the *red land*, for fear drives the barbarians before his face."⁵ The inscription says that he started from Koptos with an army, and many workmen, reached the sea, and went in ships, but of his voyage we know nothing for certain. The *red land* signifies the south coast of Arabia and East Africa, as opposed to the *black land*, or coast of Egypt. Again, Chentchetuêr, the treasurer of King Amenemhê and II., of the XII. dynasty (circ. 2700 B. C.), "returned successfully from Punt—his soldiers were with him, safe and sound, and his ships landed at Sauu."⁶ Generally it was by the Arabs that the products of the incense lands were brought to Egypt. Erman tells us: "These products were long ago sold to the Egyptians; incense and myrrh were already in the Old Kingdom the usual requisites of every rite; and one of the natives of the incense-lands, Neger Hert's'e, was a servant of the son of King Chufu (circ. 3950 B. C.) But nevertheless for many centuries to come the land of Punt seemed to the Egyptian people a half mythical fairyland." At St. Petersburg there is an Egyptian papyrus,⁷ of the Middle Kingdom, containing a fairy tale which embodied Egyptian belief in some far-off, mysterious islands beyond the ocean. There one meets with ants, or griffins, who seek gold in deserts, birds collect precious stones into their nests, that hang from beetling cliffs, and even ivory is not got from elephants, but from noble unicorns. Spices and perfumes come from these wonderful islands; there one finds ships at a certain time lying on the shore, guarded by spirits or snakes. The winds are so laden with sweet perfumes that the traveler is well nigh overpowered by their fragrance. Professor Maspéro also tells us: "The story runs that some sailors had, by going up the river Nile, at last reached the unknown sea that bathed the shores of Punt. . . . This sea was strewn with mysterious isles, like those enchanted isles which Portuguese and Breton mariners sometimes descried on the horizon, and which faded away as you got nearer. They were peopled by eerie beings, sometimes

⁴ "Aegypten" (Ad. Erman), II., p. 667. Also cf. G. Maspéro, "Histoire Ancienne," p. 161.

⁵ Lepsius, "Denkmäler," II., 150 a.

⁶ Sallier, 203. (British Museum.)

⁷ "Aegypten," p. 670, Vol. II.

⁸ Discovered in 1880 by M. Golénischeff.

cruel, sometimes friendly, to shipwrecked sailors.”⁹ In Herodotus (III., 107) we read: “Arabia is the last of inhabited countries towards the south, and is the only land which produces frankincense, myrrh, cassia, cinnamon and ladanum. The trees which bear the frankincense are guarded by winged serpents.” All these products, he tells us, are only gathered with difficulty and some risk, owing to the birds and reptiles which guard them.¹⁰ He bears independent testimony to the Egyptian folk-lore concerning Punt and the incense-lands, which was probably due to popular reports of the voyages of Arab sailors to the east coast of Africa. A few centuries later and this halo of mystery was doomed to disappear; for Queen Hatshepsu caused scenes of the land of Punt to be depicted in her great temple at Deir-el-bahri. She sent a great expedition, about 1600 B. C., to Punt. By this time the Egyptians had carried their victorious arms northwards as far as the Euphrates, and southwards to the Blue Nile, and Egypt was now the middle point between further Asia and East Africa. The scenes depicting this expedition on the walls of the Deir-el-bahri temple represented vessels laden with the precious products of Punt. The inscription runs as follows (cf. Dümichen, *Hist. Inschr.* II): “They loaded the ships very high with the products of the land of Punt, and all beautiful plants of Ta-neter, and heaps of incense trees, with green myrrh trees, with ebony together with white ivory, with white gold from the land ‘Amu, with sweet-scented woods, with incense trees and *mestem* [or *antimony*, with which the Egyptians painted their eyelids], with peacocks, long-tailed monkeys and leopards, with panther skins, with slaves and their children—never was anything like this brought to a king.

“They bring the queen as presents ‘two live panthers which shall follow her majesty; thirty-one green incense trees, which have been brought for the majesty of the god, Amon-Rê. Never has man seen the like since the world has been.”

These three inscriptions enable us to settle the geographical position of Punt. It was probably somewhere on the East African coast, as the queen of Punt is depicted as evidently suffering from leprosy; and the shores and islands of the Indian Ocean, especially Madagascar, were then, as now, a nest of leprosy. Compare the products of Punt with those mentioned in the passage already quoted by Herodotus: “Arabia is the last of inhabited countries towards the south, and it is the only country which produces frankincense, . . . cinnamon and ladanum.” He does not mean that

⁹ “*Histoire Ancienne des Peuples de l’Orient*,” p. 5. Perhaps these isles were the Socotra group.

¹⁰ The Brit. Encyclopædiæ (art. “Frankincense”) remarks that these stories were not improbably due to the fertile imaginations of Arabian spice monopolists.

all these spices *grew* in Arabia,¹¹ but that Arabia was a mart, or emporium, whence they were distributed to Egypt and other countries; for he adds (c. 111): "Where [cinnamon] grows, and what country produces it they cannot tell—only some, following probability, relate that it comes from the country in which Dionysius was reared;" and this country is Nysa, in Ethiopia, (Hdt. II., c. 146), "beyond Egypt." He says further on (III., c. 114): "Where the south declines towards the setting sun lies the country called Ethiopia, the last inhabited land in that direction. There gold is obtained in great plenty, huge elephants abound, with wild trees of all sorts, and ebony." Though the term "Ethiopia" used by the historian is not to be regarded as used with strict geographical accuracy, it would roughly correspond with South Abyssinia and Somaliland, since its products, mentioned by Herodotus, resemble those of the latter country.

Again, all the products of Punt (except peacocks) mentioned in the inscription of Queen Hatshepsu are native to Somaliland, but only the less important ones to Arabia. In the latter country there are no elephants, or ivory, very few incense trees, and of gold not a trace. But in Somaliland "gum, myrrh, frankincense¹² and aloe . . . appear in great profusion, zebras appear in large herds, the giraffe, rhinoceros and hippopotamus, gazelles and antelopes, lions and leopards, ostriches are found all over this country."¹³ Some of these animals must have been quite new to the Egyptians, so that the inscription would truly say: "Never has man seen the like since the world began."

It is very probable, therefore, that the "Punt" mentioned in the Deir-el-bahri inscriptions is the modern Somaliland, and this view is generally accepted by modern Egyptologists. The British Encyclopædia (s. v. Phœnicia) tells us: "In the Arabian caravan trade in perfumes, spices and incense for worship the Phœnicians had a lively interest (Hdt. III., c. 107). These wares were mainly produced in eastern Africa and India; but Sheba in Yemen was the emporium of the whole trade. . . . In Egypt Phœnician trade and civilization soon took firm root." The Arabs in their commerce were thus helped by their Phœnician kinsmen. "It is doubtless for this reason," says Professor Maspéro,¹⁴ "that the national name of

¹¹ He says *frankincense* was cultivated in Arabia, cinnamon in Ethiopia; he does not say explicitly where the rest grew.

¹² The chief varieties of incense trees of Somaliland are: *Ottonom seylanicum* (Hebr. Kinnamon), Frankincense (Hebr. Lebanon) (*Boswellia Thereana*, *B. Bhaudajana*, *Boswellia Carterii*), myrrh (Heb. môr) the gum resin of *Balsamodendron Myrrha*. *Pterocarpus Draco*, the "dragon's blood" of commerce, native to Socotra.

¹³ "Africa" (Keith-Johnston), p. 282.

¹⁴ "Histoire Ancienne," p. 161.

one of their tribes, *Punt*, Poeni, Puni, was applied by the Egyptians to Arabia and the Somali coast."

But where did the people of Punt obtain the gold which they gave to the Egyptians? The only gold mines in the northeast of Africa were those of the Egyptians at Koptos, and Wadi Allaga, in Nubia, as Sir G. Wilkinson has proved, but the people of Punt cannot have obtained their gold from either of these places. Moreover, these two mines could not have yielded the vast quantity of gold recorded on Egyptian monuments, apart from what the people of Punt possessed.¹⁵ The inscription of Queen Hatshepsu, however, calls it "white gold *from the land 'Amu*," *i. e.*, it was not obtained from mines in Punt. From a picture at Beni-Hassan on the tomb of Khnumhotep, a local governor of Usertesen II., of the XI. dynasty, we learn that the 'Amu were a Semitic race, perhaps from north Arabia. "The term 'Amu," says Dr. Fritz Hommel, "which was applied *in the earliest times* to the whole of the Beduin and semi-Beduin races of the adjacent Semitic countries, is probably derived from the javelin, or boomerang, which was their favorite weapon; the Egyptians *afterwards* extended the term to all Asiatics, including the Hittites."¹⁶ Hence it is called "white gold from the land 'Amu," since it was probably brought to them *by Arab merchants*, perhaps from their emporium of Yemen.

MENTION OF PUNT IN SCRIPTURES.

Again, the "Punt" of Egyptian monuments is now generally identified with the "Phut" of the Old Testament, Gen. x., 6: "Filii autem Cham; Cush, et Mizraim, et Phut et Chanaan." Kush, or Kash, in Egyptian times, represented the region south of the first cataract, and corresponded to the Ethiopia of classical geographers, while it betrayed the Mesopotamian origin of the early Egyptian people. Mizraim, a dual form of expression, is the name by which Egypt was known to the Semites, called in the cuneiform inscriptions *Musur*, (*Masr*), *i. e.*, the "borderland." Chanaan is the tract of country between Mount Hermon and the delta of the Nile.¹⁷ The

¹⁵ We can form some notion of how much gold and precious stones the ancient Egyptians possessed not only from the hieroglyphic inscriptions, but also from the jewelry disinterred from the tombs, from time to time, by Mr. de Morgan and other explorers. In 1894, for example, near the pyramids of Dashur, he found two crowns of delicately-worked gold and other gems, which had belonged to princesses of the twelfth dynasty, and which he valued at £70,000. When we notice the preponderance of gold over silver or any other metal, we need not be surprised at the gold and precious stones used in Solomon's temple, seeing that such materials were abundant many centuries before Moses lived. Cf. "History of Egypt," by Professor Flinders Petrie, etc.

¹⁶ "Ancient Hebrew Tradition" (Hommel, 1897), p. 47.

¹⁷ "Recent Archæology and the Bible" (Nicol, 1898), p. 126.

fact that three of the sons of Ham occupied contiguous territory in the northeast of Africa, from Mount Hermon to about latitude 12 degrees north., warrants us in concluding that the land of Phut likewise adjoined them, and therefore would correspond with Somaliland. The geography of these places is very complicated, because it was different at different periods, and differently represented by outsiders than by natives. Again, in Jerem. xlvii., 9, Kush and Phut are mentioned together, and in Ezech. xxvii., 10, Phut is mentioned, which is translated by "Libyes" in the Vulgate. A river Phut in Africa is alluded to by Ptolemæus IV., i., 3, and Pliny v., 13. It is hence probable that Phut refers to the Hamite people, who dwelt in the country south of modern Abyssinia, or the "Punt" of Egyptian monuments. Jeremias (xlvii., 9) had predicted the invasion of Egypt by the Babylonian King, Nabuchodonosor. "That he actually invaded Egypt we now know from a fragment of his annals. In his thirty-seventh year (567 B. C.) he marched into Egypt, defeating the Pharaoh Ahmes, and the soldiers of 'Phut of the Ionians, . . . a distant land which is in the midst of the sea.'"¹⁸ The latter were now probably allies of Egypt; but these references to Phut seem to confirm our view as to its position with regard to Egypt.

EAST AFRICA KNOWN TO THE ARABS AND EGYPTIANS (CIRC. 1800 B. C.)

We have discussed the position of Punt, and Egyptian commerce with it, at some length, since the products of Punt and Ophir are very similar, and probably came from the same country, as we shall try to prove. It may be objected that the Arab traders had never been so far south as Sofala or Zanzibar, and that the frail ships of antiquity, of which few were larger than a Thames sailing barge, could not have traversed that enormous distance amid uncharted rocks and shoals. We have proof, however, that East Africa was known even to the Egyptians during the XVIII. dynasty (1600 B. C.); in the record of the conquests of Tuthmoses III. (who lived two reigns after Queen Hatshepsu), on the northern wall of the temple of Karnak. Under this dynasty Egypt reached her palmiest days, and of the kings who led Egypt to conquests she had never dreamed of before, Tuthmoses III. was the most renowned (1503-1449 B. C.). From the Euphrates to the Egyptian Soudan he held undisputed sway. His "Song of Triumph"¹⁹ was

¹⁸ "The Egypt of the Hebrews" (Prof. Sayce), p. 130. Cf. P. Knabenbauer, S. J., in Nahum, iii., 9.

¹⁹ "We have [in it] a business-like account of his campaigns, much of it copied from the memoranda of the scribes who accompanied the army on its march." Prof. Sayce ("The Egypt of the Hebrews.")

engraved on the walls of Kamak. Among the countries subdued occurs the name Pat, an unknown locality, but Wilkinson says that this name, as indicated by the vulture's foot, was probably a Totem, and that it points to some very primitive tribe of equatorial Africa. Again, there is mention of the "circuit of the great waters," which, according to Marriette and Lenormant, perhaps refer to the equatorial lakes. Nor is this incredible, since Tuthmoses' name and inscriptions have been found as far west as Scherschell, in Algeria; and quite recently, even in Mashonaland, ushabti figures have been found from the time of Tuthmoses. Moreover, this Pharaoh kept a war fleet in the Red Sea. Among the stations visited by it, mentioned in the geographical lists of Karnak, was Ras Hafun, in Somaliland, so that Punt and the east coast was now no longer the half-mythical fairyland of yore, but a vassal State of Egypt, their tribute to Tuthmoses III. being ivory, ebony, apes and other Southern products. Therefore the Arabs must have been familiar with the east coast of Africa, and the gold of Punt was probably brought by them from Sofala, as they coasted along Africa to their great emporium, Yemen. The distance was roughly three thousand miles, yet the trade winds and monsoons were of great importance to them, which they used with great experience; and navigation was certainly highly developed. Herodotus says that the Pharaoh Neco II. (611 B. C.) sent ships from Suez, with Phœnician crews, to circumnavigate Africa. This fact, though sometimes questioned, is accepted as historically true by Professor Sayce, Maspéro and many Egyptologists. Professor Maspéro says: "This enterprise, bold at any time, was most dangerous for the small ships of the period; they had always to sail within sight of land, and the coasts of Africa make navigation difficult. For several months the Phœnicians went southwards, keeping the African shore on their right hand. Towards autumn they landed at the nearest point, planted some corn seed and waited till the grain was ripe; after reaping it, they resumed their voyage. The exact record of their observations and discoveries was soon lost: they only remembered that on reaching a certain place they saw to their amazement the sun rising on *their right hand*. They had doubled the southern cape of Africa, and began to sail northwards. In the third year they passed the Straits of Gibraltar and came into port again."²⁰ The east coast must have been one of their regular trade routes, as the names of many places along it are Arabic, *e. g.*, Sofala, Suaheli, (seashore), etc. Again, Mr. K. Johnstone says: "*From very early times* Phœnician and Arab merchants were in the habit of visiting Madagascar, and formed colonies on the northwestern

²⁰ "Histoire Ancienne," p. 537. "Egypt of the Hebrews," Sayce, p. 125.

coast."²¹ Hence the distances were not too great for the ships of those times, especially as many of the voyages were along the coast, and even nowadays Arab dhows traverse the same routes as the ships of their ancient ancestors, laden with incense, spices, ivory and other such wares (v., note 32). We will sum up briefly the conclusions we have so far arrived at: (1) The Arabs and Phœnicians must have got an immense amount of gold from Zimbabwe. This is certain. One estimate puts the value of gold thus extracted at £75,000,000. (2) The people of Punt got their gold from the Arab merchants. (3) Punt was the modern Somali coast and the opposite littoral of Arabia; its people were of Hanite origin. ("Africa," K. Johnstone.) (4) The gold ingots were brought to Punt by the Arab sailors, as they coasted northwards along Africa to Yemen, which was an Arab trade route from time immemorial. (5) The first recorded expedition to Punt of the Egyptians occurred during the eleventh dynasty (circ. 2800 B. C.)

These conclusions, which are highly probable, not only confirm the identity of Sofala with Ophir, as we shall see presently, but also that the east coast of Africa was continuously under the influence of Arabian traders, and that the mines of Zimbabwe were worked as early as the eleventh Egyptian dynasty.

SOLOMON'S EXPEDITION TO THE LAND OF OPHIR.

The building of the temple of Jerusalem is described in III. Kings v. Solomon wished to provide gold for its adornment, to pay his workmen and to fill his treasury; III. Kings ix., 27: "And King Solomon built a fleet also at Ezion-Geber, which is near Ailath on the shore of the Red Sea in Idumaea. And Hiram sent in that fleet his servants, sailors that had knowledge of the sea, with the servants of Solomon." Solomon possessed neither ships nor sailors. Now, the Phœnicians were the incontestable masters of the whole Mediterranean, but they did not possess a single port on the Red Sea, or Persian Gulf, and so they could only receive the rich products of Arabia and India by caravans. It was therefore their interest to go and seek them for themselves, in the country which produced them, by allying themselves with Solomon. Ezion-Geber was on the eastern arm of the Red Sea what Suez has in our days become on the western. Thence the fleet set out for Ophir, its destination. Where was Ophir, or at least, whence came the gold of King Solomon? The chief opinions, and the only ones which deserve our attention, are those which place this country in Africa, in Arabia and in India respectively. The Scripture says: "And

²¹ "Africa" (Johnstone), p. 516.

they came to Ophir, and they brought thence to King Solomon four hundred and twenty talents of gold." (III. Kings ix., 28.)

1. It is improbable that Ophir was in South Arabia, although Professor Keane in his recent work places Ophir there, and makes Zimbabwe, whence the gold was obtained, the "Tarshish" of the Bible. Solomon would not have built large ships at great expense to carry back through the Red Sea merchandize, that from time immemorial had been conveyed overland through Arabia by caravans, nor would the voyage have taken three years, as the text (III. Kings x., 22) denotes. Solomon built the ships to get the gold and incense trees in the country which produced them.

2. The partisans of the Indian source of Solomon's gold have a much stronger case, and include Professor Max Müller, Pere Vigouroux, etc. What were the wares brought back in Solomon's ships? They went to Tarshish and Ophir, but we are here only discussing from what country the wares were got, and not trying to identify those wares with any modern places.

But the fleet of Hiram, which brought the gold from Ophir, brought from Ophir great plenty of thyine trees and precious stones. . . . Never were such thyine trees as these brought, or seen unto this day—III. Kings x., 11, 12.

But the servants of Hiram . . . brought gold from Ophir, and thyine trees (valgu, ———), and precious stones. . . . Never were there seen in the land of Juda such trees.—II. Paralipomenon ix., 10, 11.

"For the Tarshish ships of the King used to go by sea with Hiram's ships every three years, the Tarshish ships bringing back gold, and silver, and ivory, and apes, and peacocks."—III. Kings x., 22.

The last text has been translated literally from the Hebrew; the Vulgate, the Septuagint and the Arabic versions make the writer say that Solomon's ships went every three years *to Tarshish*, reading *al* instead of *ani* before the second Tarshish. Professor Keane follows this reading, and says that Ophir was not a district, but the Arabian port to which the treasure was brought from Tarshish, and that *Tarshish* was probably Sofala. According to our interpretation, a "ship of Tarshish" means a big cargo vessel (*navis eneraria*), such as generally went to Tharsis, in Spain, just as we might speak of an "East Indiaman," or an "Atlantic liner." The repetition of a noun is not uncommon in the Old Testament, eg. in Psalm cxii., 8; Ps. cxxi., 4, 5; Ps. cxxxii., 2, etc. St. Jerome was told by his informant, a Jew, that Tarshish meant simply "high sea."

Wherever Tarshish may be, we are here only enquiring *from what country* Solomon got the gold and wares mentioned in the above

texts. We see that the wares obtained from Punt, and from Ophir (or Tarshish) are very similar.

FROM PUNT.	FROM OPHIR.
gold (from the 'Amu) silver ivory long-tailed monkeys peacocks incense-trees ²² panthers, etc.	gold silver ivory apes (gôf) peacocks (tôkei) wood of thyine trees (valgu) precious stones.
Never was anything like this brought to a king. . . . Never has man seen the like since the world began.—(Inscription in temple at Deir-el-Bahri.)	There were no such thyine trees as these brought, nor seen unto this day.—III. Kings x., 12; II. Paral. ix., 11.

The chief arguments in favor of the view that Ophir was in India are: 1. The words for peacocks and incense woods are of Malabar origin. 2. Most of the above-mentioned products are found in India. 3. Many writers in the early Christian speak of Ophir as being in India.

Professor Max Müller says: "The words used to signify apes, peacocks, ivory, and algum wood are in Hebrew foreign words, just as *gutta-percha* and *tobacco* are foreign words in French. . . . If we can find a language to which these words belong, we shall be right in concluding that the country, where this language was spoken, was the Ophir of the Bible."²³ The words for apes, peacocks, incense wood (gôf, tukki, algum) are foreign words in Hebrew. Almug, or algum is usually identified with sandal wood, which grows in Malabar and Malay (valgum); it seems to be a foreign word also in Sanskrit. *Tukki* corresponds to *tôkei* in the Tamoul or Malabar language. Now in II. Paralip. ii., 8, we read of "algum from Lebanon" (V. *pinea de Libano*), but sandal wood did not grow on Mount Lebanon, so that here "algum" must mean some other kind of incense wood. Perhaps the word was used to denote the *new species* of incense trees brought to Solomon, hitherto unknown to the Hebrews, and mistaken for one of the many sorts of sandal wood brought from India (chandana, etc.). Again, if it does mean sandal wood, one species is known in Zanzibar, and another near the river Manombolo, in Madagascar, which island the Arabs used to visit from the earliest times. Possibly, as Professor Keane suggests, the peacocks and sandal wood were got at Dhafâr in South Arabia, but at all events that "algum" means sandal wood here, must be considered at least doubtful. Again, peacocks are native to

²² The ordinary word for incense in the Vulgate is "*thus*," sometimes "*libanus*." Classical Latin has but one word, "*tus*."

²³ Max Müller, "Lessons on the Science of Language."

India, but they were introduced into Egypt and Libya by the Arabs, at a very early period, and so could have been obtained on the east African coast by Solomon's ships. Maspero says: "It is quite possible that instead of going in quest of these objects in India itself, Solomon's sailors found them in one of the numerous depôts on the coast of Africa, which had dealings with India from remote antiquity."²⁴ Possibly the Arab sailors went with the trade-winds to India, and thence with the trade-winds to Zanzibar, and then back along the coast to Yemen, so that really a voyage to Sofala was a voyage to India and further on. This theory would explain satisfactorily how the peacocks and sandal wood might have been got directly from India.

Peacocks are mentioned in Egyptian hieroglyphic inscriptions, which shows that the Egyptians were acquainted with them from the earliest times, e. g., the well-known "Hymn to Rê" (god of the sun). Erman says: "When the morning sun steps forth in the east, in the land of the gods [North Arabia], and dispels the darkness, then all living things rejoice, and before all, according to the Egyptian belief, are the peacocks, who raise their claws in prayer to the kindly stars; 'Honour to thee, O Rê at sunrise, Atum at sunset! . . . The peacocks worship him, and all wild animals together praise him.'"²⁵

Moreover, peacocks, as we saw, were brought to Queen Hatshepsu from the land of Punt, in 1600 B. C.—so they were known in Africa 500 years before Solomon's expedition to Ophir (1100 B. C.). A peacock was stamped on the money of the Phœnician colony of Leptis Minor, and was sacred in the eyes of the Libyans.

Again, the apes are called *gof* in the Hebrew; they correspond to the *Kaf* (Sanskrit *Kapi*) on Egyptian monuments, being there depicted as cynocephalous apes (e. g., in Queen Hatshepsu's inscriptions). The Septuagint uses the same word that Plato uses in his "Theatêtetos" to describe them; hence they are the species found in Somaliland and South Arabia.

Ivory, too, was abundant on the east African coast, and was common in Egypt from the earliest times, e. g., in the Louvre there is an ivory box, inscribed with the name of the Egyptian King, Nefer-ar-ka-Ra, of the Fifth Dynasty—nearly 3,500 years B. C. In the time of Tuthmoses III., to mention a single instance, tribute was paid to Egypt by the vanquished Rotennu (Syrians) in the shape of ivory, both carved and unwrought.

Again, silver, which is always found where gold abounds, forms

²⁴ "Histoire Ancienne," p. 335, note. Professor Keane suggests Dhafar in S. Arabia.

²⁵ "Aegypten," Vol. II., p. 522.

part of the mineral wealth of Rhodesia. Among the Egyptians silver was the costliest metal, because the rarest; all the more ancient inscriptions mention it before gold, and in the tombs silver ornaments are much rarer than golden ones. Probably the amount brought to Solomon was very small, for in III. Kings x., 21 we read: "All the vessels were of gold: and all the furniture was of most pure gold: there was no silver, nor was any account made of it in the days of Solomon."

As for precious stones, the early Egyptians were rich in them, and Ethiopia yielded the topaz (Job xxviii., 19), syenite, malachite, lapis lazuli and granite; also cornelian, serpentine, carbuncle and sapphire,²⁶ though some of these were found in India.

Thus all the wares brought to Solomon could have been obtained in Africa, viz., at Sofala and the Suaheli coast.

Lastly, the references to Ophir in the writers of the early centuries after Christ, seem to identify it with India. Thus Josephus tells us: "He [Solomon] bade them sail to the country formerly called Ophir, but now the land of gold, which is part of India." St. Jerome, translating Job xxviii., 16: "[Wisdom] is not compared with the gold of Ophir," renders it: "Non conferetur tinctis *Indiæ* coloribus;" in "De Locis Hebraicis" he says that Ophir is a region of India.

Also Gusebius in his "Onomasticon," and Procopius, in his "Comment in Isaïam" say the same thing. These passages might seem to prove the identity of Ophir with India, but we must remember that Josephus and the writers of the early centuries had only the vaguest notion of countries south of Arabia.²⁷ "The southern parts of the Red Sea," says M. Letronne, "often received, even in the historical and geographical works of the ancients, the name of *India*, or the epithet, *Indian*."²⁸ A vestige of this survives to-day in the name, "Indian Ocean," which washes the very shores of Natal and the Suaheli coast. Not improbably the Arab traders purposely concealed all knowledge of these places from the nations, Egypt, Palestine, etc., to whom they brought their merchandize, just as the Phoenicians kept secret the whereabouts of the Cassiterides,²⁹ or Tin Islands of S. Britain to avoid the competition of possible rivals. Strabo (bk. 3 ad fin.) relates that a Phoenician captain, when chased by a Roman, steered upon a shoal, and caused the wreck of his own

²⁶ Hummelauer, S. J. (Comment in Exod. xxvii., 17, sq.).

²⁷ Maspéro says, "Capthor, nom vague qui, comme *Tharsis* et *Ophir*, n'offrait aux Hébreux d'autre idée que celle d'un pays maritime et lointain."

²⁸ Recueil des Inscriptions, t. II. (1848), p. 37.

²⁹ Thus Herodotus (who often recounts popular legends as historical) would not believe these two facts; "I do not allow that there is any river, Eridanus . . . nor do I know of any islands, whence the tin comes which we use" (iii., 115).

and his pursuer's ship, rather than betray the secret of the tin mines in Britain.

When the navigation of the Egyptians was in its infancy, the Arabs doubtless encouraged the folk-lore we spoke of—of treasure islands guarded by mystic Genii—in order to conceal the source of their fabulous wealth, and thus to keep the monopoly of the carrying trade of the Indian Ocean, just as the Phoenicians had that of the Mediterranean.

Ophir certainly corresponds with the Sanscrit âbhira, the name of a country and its people. The name implies some shifting of a nationality, and has been forgotten later on. We cannot hence identify Ophir with Abhira, at the mouth of the Indus, especially as the products of distinctly Indian origin (peacocks and valgum) come from *Southern India*, and would have first been brought to Abhira, as to a dépôt, like the frankincense, which Arrian relates was an *import* of Barbariké on the Sinthus (Indus),⁸⁰ from Somaliland.

Again, the testimony of all travelers and prospectors is that India could never have furnished the amount of gold brought to ancient Arabia and Palestine. There are traces of ancient gold mines in Mysore, but there is no evidence to show that they were worked by Arabs or Phenicians. As for precious stones, "despite its *legendary wealth*, which is really due to the accumulation of ages, India cannot be said to be naturally rich in precious stones."⁸¹ In fact, when St. Jerome⁸² speaks of the gems in India and ("Montesque aurei,") *mountains of gold*, he is only repeating the traditional stories about India, the *locus classicus* in those days for great wealth (v. note 30), and not quoting any serious historian, or geographical writer. Thus Milton⁸³ says: "High on a throne of royal state, which far

Outshone the wealth of Ormuz or of Ind,
Or where the gorgeous east, with richest hand,
Showers on her kings barbaric pearl and gold. . . .

In fact, since Africa was practically unknown till the nineteenth century, the wealth of the East has always been attributed to India. The products brought from Ophir (with the exception of the peacocks) were not abundant in India. But when we have evidence, that in the time of the early Egyptian dynasties the Arabs brought those products from East Africa to their emporium of Sheba in Yemen, that the Egyptians from the earliest times were rich in gold and incense, that they obtained from Punt (Somaliland), the same wares that Solomon obtained 500 years later from Ophir (gold, in-

⁸⁰ Encycl. Brit. (s. v. Frankincense). About 9,000 cwt. is still annually shipped in Arab dhows to Bombay.

⁸¹ Ibid (s. v. India). Precious stones are found rather in Ceylon and Burma.

⁸² Ep. ad Rusticum, xcv.

⁸³ "Par. Lost," II., 1.

cense trees, etc.)—products so new that in both cases “never had such things been seen before,” it is very probable that they came from the same country, viz., Sofala, and the East African coast; and such a conclusion would fully explain the existence of the mysterious ruins in Rhodesia.

Among those Semitic tribes, there was a community of religious ceremonies and ideas, which took the form of a gross deification of the forces of nature. The archaic monuments left by them in parts of Arabia are similar to those of Zimbabwe, elliptic temples and stone towers symbolic of the primitive cult. The wealth of gold among the Sabaeans was shown by the overland journey of their queen to Solomon’s court, when she took with her, besides spices and precious stones, no less than 120 talents of gold, nearly equal to one-third the amount (420 talents) brought home by the Tyro-Israelitish fleet from Ophir. That the gold-producing region of Ophir was the “red land” of East Africa, now known as Mashonaland, where the river Sabi flows, there can be little doubt. A century ago Bruce fixed upon this country as the only locality corresponding to Ophir, which could have furnished the quantity of gold supplied to Arabia in remote times; and he proved by the law of the monsoons that the return journey of Solomon’s fleet Ezion-Geber to Sofala, would exactly occupy the three years assigned to it. The Greek author of the “Periplus of the Erythraean Sea,” (210 B. C.) tells us that the east coast of Africa was then in the possession of Kharibel, King of the Himyarite-Sabaeans “through ancient right;” and the Egyptian fleets sent out by the merchants of Alexandria found the vessels trading there had Arabian commanders, acquainted with the country, who could speak their language.

We have not mentioned any of the archæological finds at Zimbabwe. They only confirm our conclusions respecting the country, from which the builders came, but do not throw any light upon the ancient names of these places, nor the period at which they were built. “To clinch the matter one of two things is needed; either the decipherment in the Yemen Himyaritic inscriptions of place-names, that can be identified with East Africa sites—not an easy problem; or the discovery of Mimparitic inscriptions in Rhodesia. Surely the people who chiseled so many documents in their own land cannot have lost the epigraphic art in voyaging to the Zambesi. . . . The first object of all future excavations in Rhodesia should be the discovery of such evidence.”³⁴ Much therefore remains to be done in the way of excavation, before the mystery of these ruins which are dotted about over an area of 100,000 square miles, is fully

³⁴ *Athenæum*, March 20, 1902. Cf. the *Athenæum*, April 5, 1902, “Dr. Peters knows of two such ‘Himyaritic inscriptions’ in the Inyanga district.”

solved. The remains of forty of the ancient inhabitants have been found, buried with bangles of gold. The largest quantity thus found with a single skeleton was not less than 72 oz. (£288), and the average was as high as 17 oz. (£68). Perhaps some buried inscription may be brought to light in the near future, like the Rosetta Stone, which will give the key to the enigma of the date, builders, and history of these wonderful monuments of prehistoric ages.

Thus the gold fields of Rhodesia, which were "discovered" a few years ago by the pioneers of the "Chartered Company," were known to the Arab merchants probably 2,000 years before Christ, and are only another instance of the truth of King Solomon's words: "Nothing under the sun is new, neither is any man able to say: Behold this is new: for it hath already gone before in the ages that were before us." (Eccles. i., 10, 11.)

J. D. MURPHY, S. J.

St. Bueno's College, St. Asaph, N. Wales.

LEO PP. XIII.

AD PERPETVAM REI MEMORIAM.

VIGILANTIAE studiique memores, quo *depositum fidei* Nos quidem longe ante alios sartum tectumque praestare pro officio debemus, litteras encyclicas *Providentissimus Deus* anno MDCCCXCIII. dedimus, quibus complura de studiis Scripturae sacrae data opera complectebamur. Postulabat enim excellens rei magnitudo atque utilitas, ut istarum disciplinarum rationibus optime, quoad esset in potestate Nostra, consuleremus, praesertim cum horum temporum eruditio progrediens quaestionibus quotidie novis, aliquandoque etiam temerariis, aditum ianuamque patefaciat. Itaque universitatem catholicorum, maxime qui sacri essent ordinis, commonefecimus quae cuiusque pro facultate sua partes in hac causa forent; accurateque persequuti sumus qua ratione et via haec ipsa studia provehi congruenter temporibus oporteret. Neque in irritum huiusmodi documenta Nostra cecidere. Iucunda memoratu sunt quae subinde sacrorum Antistites aliiue praestantes doctrina viri magno numero obsequii sui testimonia deferre ad Nos maturaverint; cum et earum rerum, quas perscripseramus, opportunitatem gravitatemque efferrent, et diligenter se mandata effecturos confirmarent. Nec minus grate ea recordamur, quae in hoc genere catholici homines re deinceps praestitere, excitata passim horum

studiorum alacritate.—Verumtamen insidere vel potius ingravescere caussas videmus easdem, quamobrem eas Nos Litteras dandas censuimus. Necesse est igitur illa ipsa iam impensius urgeri praescripta: id quod Venerabilium Fratrum Episcoporum diligentiae etiam atque etiam volumus commendatum.

Sed quo facilius uberiusque res e sententia eveniat, novum quoddam auctoritatis Nostrae subsidium nunc addere decrevimus. Etenim cum divinos hodie explicare tuerique Libros, ut oportet, in tanta scientiae varietate tamque multiplici errorum forma, maius quiddam sit, quam ut id catholici interpretes recte efficere usquequaque possint singuli, expedit communia ipsorum adiuvari studia ac temperari auspicio ductuque Sedis Apostolicae. Id autem commode videmur posse consequi si, quo providentiae genere in aliis promovendis disciplinis usi sumus, eodem in hac, de qua sermo nunc est, utamur. His de caussis placet, certum quoddam Consilium sive, uti loquuntur, *Commissionem* gravium virorum institui: qui eam sibi habeant provinciam, omni ope curare et efficere, ut divina eloquia et exquisitiorem illam, quam tempora postulant, tractationem passim apud nostros invenient, et incolumbia sint non modo a quovis errorum afflatu, sed etiam ab omni opinionum temeritate. Huius Consilii praecipuam sedem esse addecet Romae, sub ipsis oculis Pontificis maximi: ut quae Urbs magistra et custos est christianae sapientiae, ex eadem in universum christianae reipublicae corpus sana et incorrupta huius quoque tam necessariae doctrinae praeceptio influat. Viri autem ex quibus id Consilium coalescet, ut suo muneri, gravi in primis et honestissimo, cumulate satisfaciant, haec proprie habebunt suae navitati proposita.

Primum omnium probe perspecto qui sint in his disciplinis hodie ingeniorum cursus, nihil ducant instituto suo alienum, quod recentiorum industria repererit novi: quin imo excubent animo, si quid dies afferat utile in exegesi Biblicam, ut id sine mora assumant communemque in usum scribendo convertant. Quamobrem ii multum operae in excolenda philologia doctrinisque finitimis, earumque persequendis progressionibus collocent. Cum enim inde fere consueverit Scripturarum oppugnatio existere, inde etiam nobis quaerenda sunt arma, ne veritatis impar sit cum errore concertatio.—Similiter danda est opera, ut minori in pretio ne sit apud nos, quam apud externos, linguarum veterum orientalium scientia, aut codicum maxime primigeniorum peritia: magna enim in his studiis est utriusque opportunitas facultatis.

Deinde quod spectat ad Scripturarum auctoritatem integre asserendam, in eo quidem acrem curam diligentiamque adhibeant. Idque praesertim laborandum ipsis est, ut nequando inter catholicos invalescat illa sentiendi agendique ratio, sane non probanda, qua scilicet plus nimio tribuitur heterodoxorum sententiis, perinde quasi germana Scripturae intelligentia ab externae eruditionis apparatu

sit in primis quaerenda. Neque enim cuiquam catholico illa possunt esse dubia, quae fusius alias Ipsi revocavimus: Deum non privato doctorum iudicio permisisse Scripturas, sed magisterio Ecclesiae interpretandas tradidisse; "in rebus fidei et morum, ad aedificationem doctrinae christianae pertinentium, eum pro vero sensu sacrae Scripturae habendum esse, quem tenuit ac tenet sancta Mater Ecclesia, cuius est iudicare de vero sensu et interpretatione Scripturarum sanctarum; atque ideo nemini licere contra hunc sensum aut etiam contra unanimem consensum Patrum ipsam Scripturam sacram interpretari;" eam esse divinorum naturam Librorum, ut ad religiosam illam, qua involvuntur, obscuritatem illustrandam subinde non valeant hermeneuticae leges, verum dux et magistra divinitus data opus sit, Ecclesia; demum legitimum divinae Scripturae sensum extra Ecclesiam neutiquam reperiri, neque ab eis tradi posse qui magisterium ipsius auctoritatemque repudiaverint.—Ergo viris qui de Consilio fuerint, curandum sedulo, ut horum diligentior quotidie sit custodia principiorum: adducanturque persuadendo, si qui forte heterodoxos admirantur praeter modum, ut magistram studiosius observent audiantque Ecclesiam. Quamquam usu quidem venit catholico interpreti, ut aliquid ex alienis auctoribus, maxime in re critica, capiat adiumenti: sed cautione opus ac delectu est. Artis criticae disciplinam, quippe percipiendae penitus hagiographorum sententiae perutilem, Nobis vehementer probantibus, nostri excolant. Hanc ipsam facultatem, adhibita loco ope heterodoxorum, Nobis non repugnantibus, iidem exacuant. Videant tamen ne ex hac consuetudine intemperantiam iudicii imbibant: siquidem in hanc saepe recidit artificium illud criticae, ut aiunt, sublimioris; cuius periculosam temeritatem plus semel Ipsi denuntiavimus.

Tertio loco, in eam studiorum horum partem quae proprie est de exponendis Scripturis, cum latissime fidelium utilitati pateat, singulares quasdam curas Consilium insumat. Ac de iis quidem testimoniis, quorum sensus aut per sacros auctores aut per Ecclesiam authentice declaratus sit, vix attinet dicere, convincendum esse, eam interpretationem solam ad sanae hermeneuticae leges posse probari. Sunt autem non pauca, de quibus cum nulla extiterit adhuc certa et definita expositio Ecclesiae, liceat privatis doctoribus eam, quam quisque probarit, sequi tuerique sententiam: quibus tamen in locis cognitum est analogiam fidei catholicamque doctrinam servari tamquam normam oportere. Iamvero in hoc genere magnopere providendum est, ut ne acrior disputandi contentio transgrediatur mutuae caritatis terminos; neve inter disputandum ipsae revelatae veritates divinaeque traditiones vocari in disceptationem videantur. Nisi enim salva consensione animorum collocatisque in tuto principiis, non licebit ex variis multorum studiis magnos expectare huius dis-

ciplinæ progressus.—Quare hoc etiam in mandatis Consilio sit, præcipuas inter doctores catholicos rite et pro dignitate moderari quaestiones; ad easque finiendas qua lumen iudicii sui, qua pondus auctoritatis afferre. Atque hinc illud etiam consequetur commodi, ut maturitas offeratur Apostolicae Sedi declarandi quid a catholicis inviolate tenendum, quid investigationi altiori reservandum, quid singulorum iudicio relinquendum sit.

Quod igitur christianae veritati conservandae bene vertat, studiis Scripturae sanctae promovendis ad eas leges, quae supra statutae sunt, Consilium sive *Commissionem* in hac alma Urbe per has litteras instituimus. Id autem Consilium constare volumus ex aliquot S. R. E. Cardinalibus auctoritate Nostra deligendis: iisque in communione studiorum laborumque mens est adiungere cum Consultorum officio ac nomine, ut in sacris urbanis Consiliis mos est, claros nonnullos, alios ex alia gente, viros quorum a doctrina sacra, praesertim biblica, sit commendatio. Consilii autem erit et statis conventibus habendis, et scriptis vel in dies certos vel pro re nata vulgandis, et si rogatum sententiam fuerit, respondendo consulentibus, denique omnibus modis, horum studiorum, quae dicta sunt, tuitioni et incremento prodesse. Quaecumque vero res consultae communiter fuerint, de iis rebus referri ad Summum Pontificem volumus; per illum autem ex Consultoribus referri, cui Pontifex ut sit ab actis Consilii mandaverit.—Atque ut communibus iuvandis laboribus supellex opportuna suppetat, iam nunc certam Bibliothecae Nostrae Vaticanae ei rei addicimus partem; ibique digerendam mox curabimus codicum voluminumque de re Biblica collectam ex omni aetate copiam, quae Consilii viris in promptu sit. In quorum instructum ornatumque praesidiorum valde optandum est locupletiores catholici Nobis suppetias veniant vel utilibus mittendis libris; atque ita peropportuno genere officii Deo, Scripturarum Auctori, itemque Ecclesiae navare operam velint.

Ceterum confidimus fore, ut his coeptis Nostris, utpote quae christianae fidei incolumitatem sempiternamque animarum salutem recta spectent, divina benignitas abunde faveat; eiusque munere, Apostolicae Sedis in hac re praescriptionibus catholici, qui sacris Litteris sunt dediti, cum absoluto numeris omnibus obsequio respondeant.

Quae vero in hac caussa statuere ac decernere visum est, ea omnia et singula uti statuta et decreta sunt, ita rata et firma esse ac manere volumus et iubemus; contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum sub anulo Piscatoris die XXX. Octobris anno MDCCCCII., Pontificatus Nostri vicesimo quinto.

A. CARD. MACCHI.

APOSTOLIC LETTER OF OUR HOLY FATHER LEO XIII.

BY DIVINE PROVIDENCE POPE,

ON THE INSTITUTION OF A COMMISSION FOR BIBLICAL STUDIES.

LEO XIII. POPE IN ETERNAL MEMORY.

FAITHFUL to the tradition of watchfulness and zeal by which we, first of all, because of our office, are bound to preserve the deposit of Faith safe and inviolate, we gave to the wor'd in the year 1893, the Encyclical *Providentissimus*. In it we included, after due examination, a number of questions concerning the study of Holy Scripture. The grandeur and extreme utility of the subject impelled us, in effect, to determine, as far as in us lay, the directive principle of those studies so necessary now that the increase of erudition confronts us every day with the consideration of novel questions which are sometimes in danger of being treated in a manner fraught with rashness.

Wherefore, we have warned all Catholics and especially those in holy orders, of the work which each one should undertake in this matter in accordance with the abilities with which he is endowed, and we applied ourselves with the greatest care to show how and in what manner, these studies should be developed in conformity with the needs of our epoch. This document has not been without result, and it is with joy that we recall the testimonies of submission which the Bishops and a great number of men eminent in science hastened to give us while proclaiming at the same time the opportuneness and the importance of what we had written; and promising to conform with the greatest diligence to our instructions. Another remembrance no less agreeable comes to us in the fact that excellent beginnings were immediately made by some in the direction indicated, and an enthusiasm awakened in various places in the prosecution of such studies. Nevertheless we remark that the causes which prompted us to publish the previous letter are still persistent and more serious. It is therefore necessary to insist more emphatically on what has already been enjoined and more than ever to express our desire that our Venerable Brethren of the episcopate should watch with the greatest vigilance over these studies. To ensure greater facility as well as fruitfulness, we have resolved to add new strength to our authority in this matter. As the task now before us of explaining these divine books and maintaining them intact is too difficult for our Catholic interpreters to acquit themselves well of,

if left to their individual efforts, and because the work is nevertheless so necessary on account of the manifold developments of science and the appearance of such multitudinous error, it is deemed proper that a federation of energies should be made, and that assistance should be afforded under the auspices and direction of the Apostolic See. This result, it appears to us, can be easily attained if we make use in the present instance of the means which we have already employed for advancing other studies.

Wherefore it has seemed good to us to institute a council or, as it is termed, a Commission of men of learning whose duty shall be to effect that in every possible manner the divine text will find here and from every quarter the most thorough interpretation which is demanded by our times, and be shielded not only from every breath of error but also from every temerarious opinion. It is proper that the principal seat of this Commission should be in Rome, under the very eyes of the Sovereign Pontiff. As it is the seat of the mistress and guardian of Christian knowledge it should also be the centre from which there should flow through the whole body of the Christian commonwealth the pure and incorruptible teaching of this science which is now so indispensable. The men of whom this Commission shall be composed and who to satisfy fully the serious obligation which is laid upon them and which confers on them such distinction, should regard as peculiarly and especially their own the tasks which are here proposed to their zeal.

In the first place, having established exactly what is the actual intellectual trend of the present day with regard to this science, they should bear in mind that none of the recent discoveries which the human mind has made, is foreign to the purpose of their work. On the contrary, let them make haste in any case where our times have discovered something useful in the matter of biblical exegesis, to avail themselves of it forthwith and by their writings to put it at the service of all.

Wherefore they should devote themselves with the greatest care to the study of philology and kindred sciences and keep themselves abreast of the progress of the day. As it is generally on this point that the attacks on Holy Scripture are made, it is there that we should likewise gather our arms of defense; so that there may be no inequality in the struggle between truth and error. Likewise they shall take measures that the knowledge of the ancient and oriental languages, and above all the art of deciphering the ancient texts should be assiduously cultivated. In our contest with unbelievers, both of these kinds of studies are, as a matter of fact, a precious help in biblical studies.

In what concerns the integral safeguarding of the authority of the

Scriptures, the members of the Commission will employ an active vigilance and unremitting assiduity. The main point to be attained is that Catholics should not admit the malignant principle of granting more than is due to the opinion of heterodox writers, and of thinking that the true understanding of the Scriptures should be sought first of all in the researches which the erudition of unbelievers has arrived at. Indeed, no Catholic can consider as subject to doubt these truths which we have elsewhere referred to at greater length, and they must know that God has not delivered the Scriptures to the private judgment of the learned, but has confided the interpretation of them to the teaching of the Church. In the matter of faith and morals which pertain to the teaching of Christian Doctrine, the sense of Holy Scripture, which must be considered as the true sense, is that which has been adopted and is adopted by our holy Mother, the Church, whose office it is to judge of the real meaning and interpretation of Holy Scriptures. It is therefore not permitted to any one to interpret the Holy Scripture in any way contrary to this sense, or even in any way contrary to the universal opinion of the Fathers. As we were saying, the nature of the divine books is such that in order to dissipate the religious obscurity with which they are shrouded we must never count on the laws of hermeneutics, but must address ourselves to the Church which has been given by God to mankind as a guide and mistress. In brief, the legitimate sense of the divine Scriptures ought not to be found outside the Church nor be pronounced by those who have repudiated its teaching and authority.

The men who are to compose this Commission should therefore watch with great care to safeguard these principles and to keep them, as time goes on, with still greater strictness. And if certain minds profess an exaggerated admiration for heterodox writers, they must be led by persuasion to follow and to obey more faithfully the direction of the Church.

Doubtless there may arise an occasion when the Catholic interpreter may find some assistance in authors outside of the Church, especially in matters of criticism, but here there is need of prudence and discernment. Let our doctors cultivate with care the science of criticism, for it is of great utility in order to grasp in its complete sense the opinion of hagiographers; and in that they will receive our warmest approbation. Let them draw from this science new resources by availing themselves even of the assistance of non-Catholic scholars. In doing so they need not fear our disapprobation. They should however be careful not to draw from habitual association with such writers independence of judgment, for in point of fact the system which is known in our days as higher criticism frequently

leads to such results. Its dangerous rashness we have more than once already condemned.

In the third place, it is of importance that this Commission should consecrate its most special attention to that part of these studies which properly concerns the explanation of the Scriptures and which opens to the faithful a great source of spiritual profit. In whatever touches the texts whose sense has been fixed in an authentic manner, either by the sacred writers or by the Church, the Commission, it is needless to say should be convinced that only that interpretation can be adopted. Such is the rule of sound hermeneutics. But there exist numerous passages upon which the Church has not yet given any fixed or precise definition with regard to which it is permitted to each doctor in his individual capacity to profess and to sustain the opinion which seems to him to be correct. They must know, however, that on these points they should keep as the rules of interpretation the analogy of faith and of Catholic doctrine. Moreover, we must be on our guard in this matter against transgressing, in the excessive ardor of debate, the limits of mutual charity. It is also of importance not to seem to discuss revealed truths and divine traditions. If they make light of intellectual concord, and if these principles are not safeguarded, we cannot have any right to expect that the divergent labors of such a great number of scholars will accomplish any notable progress in this science.

Hence this Commission will have as its task to regulate in a legitimate and suitable manner the principal questions which are pending between Catholic doctors in order to arrive at a conclusion. To settle them the assembly will lend sometimes the light of its judgment, sometimes the weight of its authority. Their investigations will also have a result of the greatest advantage, namely, that of furnishing to the Holy See an opportune occasion to declare what ought to be inviolably maintained by Catholics, what ought to be reserved for more profound research and what ought to be left to the free judgment of each.

Having therefore in view to ensure the maintenance of Catholic authority in its integrity, and to promote the studies which relate to Holy Scripture in conformity with the rules which have been herein laid down, we, by these present Letters, establish in this illustrious city, a council or a special Commission. We wish it to be composed of some Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church who shall be chosen in virtue of our authority. It is our intention to add to them with the functions and titles of consultors, and to take part in the same studies and the same labors, as it is customary in the sacred Roman Commissions, certain eminent men who belong to different nationalities, who are recommended by their knowledge in sacred studies, and above all, in whatever appertains to biblical science.

The Commission will hold its fixed reunions and publish its writings, which will appear periodically or as need may require. If advice is asked of it, it will reply to those who consult it. In a word, it will labor by all means in its power to maintain and to develop the studies of which we speak. We desire that a report concerning all the questions which may be treated in common, should be addressed to the Sovereign Pontiff by the Consultor, to whom the Commission will have confided the office of Secretary.

In order to furnish members of the Commission with available help, which will be of service to them in any of these studies, we herewith assign to them for this purpose a certain portion of our Vatican Library. We shall take care that a numerous collection of manuscripts and volumes of every epoch which treat of Biblical questions shall without delay be classified and placed at the disposition of the Commissioners. It is very desirable that well-to-do Catholics should come to our assistance to establish and enlarge this library in sending to us resources to be employed for this end, or useful books, and in so doing they will render a service in a most fitting manner to Almighty God, who is the Author of Scriptures and of the Church.

Moreover, we have confidence that Divine Providence will amply bless this undertaking, which has for its direct object the safeguarding of Christian faith and the eternal salvation of souls, and that Catholics who are devoted to the Holy Books will respond with an absolute and complete submission to the declarations of the Holy See on this point. We wish and we ordain that all and every one of these prescriptions and decisions which it has seemed good to us to make and to formulate on this point shall be and shall remain ratified and confirmed in the manner which we have adopted and formulated any clause to the contrary notwithstanding.

Given in Rome at St. Peter's, under the Ring of the Fisherman, the 30th of October, the year 1902, Twenty-fifth of our Pontificate.

TO CARDINAL MACCHI.

Scientific Chronicle.

LIQUID FUEL IN PRACTICE.

In our last Chronicle we spoke of the use of liquid fuel in locomotives and stationary engines, we have now to record its practical application for marine purposes. The Oceanic Steamship Company has lately fitted out the single-screw iron steamer "Mariposa" with new engines and a plant for the burning of liquid fuel only. The Bureau of Steam Engineering which is investigating the question of liquid fuel for use in the United States Navy gives the report of Commander H. N. Stevenson who witnessed the trial trips of the "Mariposa" and of Lieutenant Ward P. Winchell who represented the Department on the round trip made by the vessel between San Francisco and Tahiti.

The oil is atomized as explained in our last article but by a special process and the air is heated before mingling with the oil-vapor. Some facts gathered from the observation of the way in which the heating apparatus behaved and from the results obtained will give an idea of its success and promise.

The first trial trip was not satisfactory. This was due to the fact that the installment for the burning of the oil was not complete. The boilers primed badly because the construction dirt had not been removed, the oil burners clogged with dirty oil for no strainer had been fitted, the tell-tale device to indicate the height of the oil in the service tank and the controlling device for the oil pump were also wanting. This trip was intended rather to gain some experience and acquaint the force in the fire-room with the use of the apparatus for oil firing. No attempt was made to measure the amount of oil burned nor to attain a maximum speed, so this trip furnished no data, except the study of the working of the oil apparatus.

One accident that occurred during the trial served to bring out one advantageous feature of the oil burner for generating steam. The oil in the small heating tank overflowed and choked the burners. By means of a lever the valves in the air and oil pipes were shut. The atomizer tubes where the oil had caked were unscrewed and clean ones put in their places. During the time that it took to make the change, which was fifteen minutes for all, very little steam pressure was lost and the vessel kept on her way with but little decrease in speed. The value of being able to shut off the oil and air quickly and clean the atomizers or replace them by new ones is a decided

advantage. The closing of the valves by a lever permits the adjustment of the air and oil supply to remain and the fire can at once be started with perfect adjustment if at the time of shut down it was satisfactory.

For the second trial trip the oil strainer and the regulating device for the heater tank were completed. On this trip the oil apparatus worked well and was handled with great ease and uniformity and the smoke resulting from the combustion was scarcely noticeable for an hour at a time. An average speed of 14 and $\frac{1}{4}$ knots per hour was maintained. The steam pressure was maintained at any desired point uniformly and without difficulty.

On the round trip to Tahiti better results were obtained although there were some drawbacks which experience shows can be overcome. The principal difficulties encountered were in regulating the supply of oil to the heaters by means of the pump. This was due to the fact that an automatic submerged float intended to control the throttle of the pump did not work well, and the supply of oil was regulated by hand. There was trouble also with the oil strainers. They became clogged with dirt and allowed no oil to pass. This difficulty can be obviated by arranging the strainers in pairs so that a clean one can be switched in while the choked one is cleaning.

The furnaces had not been cleaned after the trial trips and on arriving at Tahiti this work was attended to. The tubes were swept, the back connections, uptakes, ash pans and furnaces were cleaned and the refuse taken from all these places barely filled two ash buckets. As a result it has been determined to sweep the tubes only after the round trip of twenty-four days steaming. Only ordinary precautions were taken to guard against fire or explosion. All the spaces to which oil has access are well ventilated by inlet and outlet ducts. The oil used is from the Kern river district, California, and is a thick dark liquid resembling molasses, but it gives off volatile gases that form explosive mixtures with air, still it is handled with the same ease as if it were so much coal.

This same vessel as coal burner had a force of thirty-six men in the engine and boiler rooms but as an oil burner this force is reduced by nineteen. This in itself shows a great saving in running expenses. Full power was not developed in the two boilers used, as schedule time was easily exceeded, with from two to four of the burners shut off.

From the expert testimony of the value of oil in this case and in others the following advantages of oil over coal as a source of heat for naval purposes may be summarized. Its use does away with the production of heavy smoke that reveals to the enemy the whereabouts of the vessel. A sudden call for more steam can be promptly

and effectively met. The greater effectiveness of the furnace must also be considered as well as the great relief to the stokers on account of the ease of firing. When coal is burned recourse is had to a forced draft to accelerate the combustion. The effect of the forced draft is to produce the maximum intensity of heat at the back part of the furnace. This is injurious to the boilers and increases the amount of heat wasted in the uptake. With liquid fuel the most intense combustion can be maintained and controlled in the front part of the furnace, thus securing a better utilization of the heat and guarding against serious injury to the boilers.

Yet with all these advantages it is still doubtful whether the Bureau of Steam Engineering will recommend the adoption of liquid fuel for the navy. It is true that at present there are serious difficulties in the way. The principal ones are those which while they are not insurmountable, are sufficiently formidable to delay recommendation of this method of heating on any large scale for naval purposes until such time as fuller tests can be made under the actual conditions in which it is to be used in the navy, which conditions are quite different from those of the merchant marine. It is likely then that tests will be made on some of our torpedo boats and destroyers. The main difficulties arise from cost and supply and the structural difficulties that must be overcome in properly storing the oil in our large battleships.

With regard to the difficulty of cost and supply while it may be less than that of coal for vessels of the merchant marine that travel between fixed ports where there is a sufficient supply of oil, still the same is not true of naval vessels that must be ready to steam at any time to any port within their steaming radius. To keep an adequate supply of oil for such purposes would become a military problem involving a complete chain of fuel stations between country and colony. The present cost of transportation of oil is far in excess of that of coal. This is partly due to the difficulties encountered in the construction of the oil tank steamers and the consequent expense, which will no doubt be reduced when there is an increased demand for oil. Still this high cost must be taken into account in any present installation for oil fuel.

The adapting the battle ship as a carrier of oil fuel may be much more difficult. The deck of the ship must be a clear gun-platform and hence the oil will have to be stored in the double bottoms of such vessels. This makes the problem of ventilation difficult and increases the danger of explosion from the heavy gases that are given off from the oil and which when mixed with air might be very easily exploded by a spark from the numerous electric wires and appliances found on board these vessels.

Further study, however, of the problem is to be made and even if it does not result in the universal adoption of oil for all the vessels of the navy, it will bring to light much useful information which will be of value where oil fuel is practicable.

COMMERCIAL OXYGEN.

Oxygen has many uses especially in metallurgical operations and hence the prospect of its manufacture on a commercial scale is of great interest. Professor von Linde has lately suggested its commercial production through the agency of liquid air. If the process meets with success it gives a practical application to liquid air. The critical temperature of the air or the point at which it liquefies at the atmospheric pressure is about 191 degrees centigrade. The principal constituents of the liquid air are oxygen and nitrogen and they have different boiling points. Nitrogen evaporates at 195.5 degrees, but oxygen does not boil until the temperature has been raised to 182.5 degrees. On account of this difference of 13 degrees it is possible to separate the nitrogen from the oxygen, thus obtaining a supply of liquid oxygen. Since in liquid air there is, in every five parts only one of oxygen to four of nitrogen, four-fifths of the liquid must be evaporated at the lower temperature in order to leave liquid oxygen behind. When about 60 per cent. of the liquid air is evaporated the residue contains equal parts of oxygen and nitrogen. To liquefy one cubic metre of air requires two horse power and of this quantity only one-fifth is oxygen. This shows that if oxygen is to be obtained in this way on a commercial scale some cheaper method of manufacturing liquid air must be devised. Hence the query, where does the greater part of this two horse power go? It is used principally in reducing the temperature. Hence if the temperature could be reduced a smaller amount of energy would be required to liquefy the air. Just here do we find the value of the method suggested by Professor von Linde. He utilizes the cooling effect of the evaporating nitrogen to reduce the temperature of a new quantity of air so that a smaller expenditure of new energy is required to liquefy it. That this effect is reached by the evaporating nitrogen is evident, for in reducing it to the liquid condition a large quantity of heat was abstracted from it. To return it again to the gaseous condition an equal amount of heat is required and if when it is returning, it be mechanically arranged that the change occur near a quantity of air, the heat will be taken from the air and its temperature thus reduced. The Linde Ice Machine Company are

using such a process at Munich. Some of their results give us data for calculating the cost. A mixture of equal parts of oxygen and nitrogen, an oxygen sufficiently pure for most practical purposes, can be made at the rate of 100 cubic metres per hour by the expenditure of 100 horse power of energy. To obtain pure oxygen a greater expenditure is required; but it is stated that it can be produced at the rate of half a cubic metre per hour per horse power. As the cost of power varies with different localities and the different sources employed, the cost of the oxygen will vary, but can be easily calculated.

To this method must be added that of M. George F. Jaubert. In his investigations he sought a method whereby oxygen might be produced in a way similar to that in which acetylene gas is produced from calcium carbide. If calcium carbide is put into water the acetylene gas is given off. The oxygen problem then was to find a substance that put into water would give off oxygen in good quantities and at a rate that could be controlled. Such a substance is the peroxide of sodium, or the peroxide of potassium. These substances are formed by heating the metal sodium or the metal potassium in a current of oxygen when they absorb the gas in varying proportions. When they are put into water they are decomposed and give off the gas in a very pure condition. M. Jaubert has found a cheap way of manufacturing these substances and a plant for that purpose has been established. The peroxides are furnished as small $1\frac{1}{2}$ inch cubes or as pellets $\frac{1}{2}$ inch in diameter. They are used in a gas generator just as the carbide is used and the oxygen given off is regulated and collected. The peroxide is promised at a price as low as 10 cents per pound. One pound of it will furnish between 75 and 125 litres of oxygen. The gas made in this way should have a large use in artificial respiration, in diving apparatus and in submarine boats.

UTILIZATION OF CITY REFUSE.

In our last Chronicle we described the treatment of city sewage. It may be of interest to know that the solid refuse which, for sanitary reasons, is collected in the cities of the civilized world, is generally utilized for industrial purposes. Formerly this refuse was accumulated and then disposed of by burning or used as a filler whereby waste lands were reclaimed. Food wastes are usually collected separately and utilized for special purposes to which we shall refer. All other solid refuse is subjected to a rough assortment. Bones,

glass, rags, iron, paper and the like are separately collected and sold for reutilization in the branches of industry of which they were original products or as factors in new industries. Old tin cans are ordinarily used for one of three purposes ; first for the recovery of the tin that is in them, secondly for the recovery of the solder along their seams and thirdly for smelting purposes in the manufacture of steel and iron. The inflammable refuse is consumed in furnaces and the steam generated utilized in operating engines for purposes of electric lighting and power. Lord Playfair in an article in the *North American Review* states that the city of Glasgow obtains from such waste heat equal to nearly 9,000 horse power per day of ten hours and this heat is used for manufacturing purposes.

Food wastes are profitably used by what is known as the Arnold utilization process. This process consists in digesting the waste in steam digesters where it is separated into greases and a residue used in fertilizers. These greases are nearly all shipped abroad where they are refined and graded as glycerin, red oil, lard oil and poorer grades. The secret of treating garbage grease seems to be held abroad, for little or none of it is held for treatment in this country. The treatment of the garbage requires about eight hours and during this time it is subjected in the digesters to the action of steam at a pressure varying from forty to eighty pounds. The vapors of the cooking are not allowed to escape but are condensed. After the cooking the contents of the digesters are discharged into tanks from which it goes to presses where the grease and water are separated from the solids. The solids are put through screens where metals, bones and pieces of crockery are separated from the fertilizer proper which is then dried and bagged for shipment. The liquids are run into tanks where by gravity the oil and water are separated. Here the grease is skimmed off and barrelled for shipment. This is another illustration of the way in which science turns to useful purposes what was so long regarded as useless.

D. T. O'SULLIVAN, S. J.

Boston, Mass.

Book Reviews.

MUSIC IN THE HISTORY OF THE WESTERN CHURCH. By *Edward Dickinson*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1902.

Professor Dickinson, whose admirable articles in the *Quarterly* aroused more than a passing comment, and which we are glad to find incorporated in this volume, has given us under the above title a work worthy of the highest commendation. It will be found of valuable service to the student of church history as well as music, and, we might add, the liturgy. The work, free from all pedantry and speculative hypotheses, shows a deep, honest, painstaking study of almost all available sources, a keen appreciation of the inner life of the Church and a trustworthy knowledge of its doctrine, symbolism and liturgy. Above all, it has the proper grasp of a subject much misunderstood—the function of music as the handmaid of religion, its relative and anciliar association with the liturgy. It handles the subject, a stumbling block to most Protestant historians, with such lucidity, sympathy and accuracy—is so intuitively in touch and harmony with the true teaching, practice and spirit of the Church—that one can hardly dispel the illusion that the writer is not to the Catholic manor born.

There are few or no indications in the volume of 421 pages that would lead to the inference that the Professor is not the accredited lecturer in some Catholic theological seminary, instead of being the Professor of the History of Music, in the Conservatory of Music, Oberlin College. Oberlin can take pride in its chair of music. The knowledge of every Catholic student or priest cannot fail but be enriched, his love for true church music quickened, the beauty of the liturgy more fully revealed, higher ideals implanted by coming in contact with such a work.

It is not a mere haphazard compilation, which most of our histories of music are; nor is it a detailed narrative of dry and dull data which usually form the pabulum of commercial hackwriters; nor does it show reverence or fear in striking at some of the “consecrated falsehoods” of centuries. It shows deep research, originality of presentation, a judicious use of a vast bibliography and, above all, a fearless intrepidity in publishing the results of honest, critical investigation. Few writers, for instance, would state in public print, even if we mistake not in the pages of the *Bibliotheca Sacra* the fact which almost every conscientious student of the history of music long since knew that “Luther composed no

[hymn] tunes. Under patient investigation of a half century, the melodies originally associated with Luther's hymns have all been traced to their sources" (p. 259). That even Luther's battle song, "Eine feste Burg," on which so much maudlin sentimentality has been lavished, from Heine to Carlyle in literature, from Mendellsohn to Wagner in music, proves to be nothing more than an adaptation from an old Mass. In the face of Bäumker's riddling criticism of the legend, we still have Naumann and his Anglican editor Ouseley try and prop up the decrepit and discredited fiction. Nor does he hesitate to assail the equally unhistorical myth about Palestrina being the "Saviour of Church Music," because his *Missa Papae Marcelli* disarmed all opposition and criticism—which still circulates in Catholic books.

Where in English Catholic literature can we secure a more thorough, sympathetic study of music in its relation to the Primitive Church and its liturgy than we do here under the captions, "Ritual and Song in the Early Christian Church" and the "Liturgy of the Catholic Church"? If Ambros' great history were accessible to the English reader, we might have a more scholarly and exhaustive treatment—one entering into every detail of the liturgical chant—but it could hardly be more accurate and sympathetic than this condensed form. Few Catholic writers on music rise to a more intelligent apprehension, discern the inherent appropriateness, the devotional fervor and withal the artistic attributes and adaptability of Gregorian Chant to the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. How one can read the chapter on "The Ritual Chant of the Catholic Church," which has elicited the unstinted admiration of almost every great musician from Mozart to Wagner, without feeling a sense of deprivation, in view of the inane trash that greets us Sunday after Sunday, is hard to explain. Again, where, outside of a few scattered monographs or essays, usually in German or French, do we find such a clear, illuminative study of "The Modern Musical Mass" than on page 182?

The work will be a valuable accession to the library of every student who wishes to know and understand the true musical treasure trove of the Catholic Church. Its use as a text book in some of our seminaries would be productive of a vast amount of good.

A few inadvertencies do not materially detract from the solid worth or critical trustworthiness of the book. Thus, the expression "adoration of the Virgin Mother" (p. 231) may convey a wrong meaning to the unintelligent or cursory reader. The great Benedictine monastery at Beuron, Germany, and the Paulist Fathers, New York, deserve a mention for cultivating the Gregorian Chant to the exclusion of all other kinds of music. The Beuron School of Gre-

gorian Music is probably without a rival. The addition of Wackernagel's epoch-making work on the German *Kirchenlied*, as well as Gerbert's *Scriptores ecclesiastici de musica*, would contribute materially to the excellent bibliography given.

H. G. G.

A-T-ON INTÉRÊT À S'EMPARER DU POUVOIR? Par *Edmond Demolins*. Firmin-Didot, 58 Rue Jacob, Paris. Pp. 338. Price, 3½ francs.

The name Edmond Demolins is likely to be associated in the reader's mind with a book that won for itself a universal interest some few years ago, entitled the Superiority of the Anglo-Saxons—*A quoi tient la Supériorité des Anglo-Saxons*—a book which within its brief life has passed into English, German, Spanish, Polish and Arabian. Other works from the same author have found a wide circle of admirers, notably *The Frenchmen of To-day* and *The New Education*. The latter book sets forth the author's ideas and program of education of boys which he has practically embodied in the *Ecole des Roches*—a school located at Verneuil near Paris. The latest book by M. Demolins may be said to furnish the natural and necessary conclusion to the first of the works just mentioned. The burden of both is the proof of the thesis that "the Yankee and the Englishman are to-day the freest men that now exist and that ever have existed and that "they owe their undeniable superiority to the extraordinary power of private life and the narrow limitations of public life" (p. 139). It does not fall within the lines of the present review to discuss the author's claims for American Anglo-Saxon superiority amongst the nations. Aside, however, from this portion of his arguments in support of what he regards as the cause of the alleged superiority are strong and are cleverly handled. Deduced from ancient and modern history they throw a multiplied illumination on the central idea that the greed for political power saps the vigor and life of individuals and of peoples. The author shows in a striking if not entirely novel fashion this to have been the cause of the ancient Greek and Roman decadence and in modern times of the Spanish; and he points to the same cause as hastening unmistakably the decline of his own country, France. On the other hand, he indicates how the development of private initiative, the growth of the virile qualities of the individual as such, has created the superiority of societies both ancient and modern. Liberty he shows is better guarded by private initiative than by universal suffrage. The development of political powers means war; the development of individuality means peace. The most effectual means for a man to become superior is for him to place himself in the

necessity of undertaking an enterprise that depends on himself alone, that can succeed only by his personal effort and by long perseverance. In other words, it is the necessity of conquering by self-reliance that tempers character, fortifies the will and assures success. Now this necessity, says M. Demolins, manifests itself very differently according as public life predominates over private, or vice versa. In the first case, in societies with large public powers, the controlling thought of every one is to make a living at the public expense, to install himself comfortably in some of the countless sinecures of the huge administrative organism. Personal energy, individual initiative are lessened, and more and more atrophied, because reliance is placed on the group, on the great public body, instead of on individual force. Rapidly then does the race decline and collapse. On the other hand, in societies with restricted powers the individual has no resource from those assured and tranquil positions and is forced by circumstances to create for himself the means of existence through his own endeavor and labor. Thus personal energy, individual initiative, are stimulated to their maximum, and rapidly the race develops and rises above others.

The author illustrates this line of argument by the examples on the one side of the French Jew and Protestant and on the other side by that of Poland and Ireland and Catholic France of the present day. M. Demolins is, so far as we can detect, a Catholic and writes as such. He contends that the material prosperity attained by the French Jew and Protestant is not at all dependent on their religious tenets, no more than the material decadence of Catholics in France of to-day results from their faith. In the one case the force of circumstances necessitated private initiative, which lead on to national success, in the other case reliance on political power occasioned decline of personal effort and consequent national decay. Evidently these illustrations open out a wide field for discussion, upon which we cannot enter here. Making due allowance for the author's somewhat excessive admiration for the English speaking nations, we must admit his dominant opinion as regards at least one of the causes of material prosperity amongst those nations, the play and development of individual initiative. How the working of this cause is to be controlled so as not to result in the production of a race of consummate egoists, self seeking money instead of political power grabbers is of course the problem. M. Demolins' closing chapter throws some light on the question. He argues strongly in favor of developing the money making but at the same time the money spending faculty. Money, he says, is an element of individual moralization and of social progress, but only under two imperative conditions. A man should be able to make money hon-

estly and painfully, and should know how to spend it usefully and generously. To gain money painfully develops energy and endurance, makes a man love obstacles and habituates him to master them. To spend money usefully and largely elevates and ennoble the soul. Money thus becomes not an end but a means—a means to ameliorate human conditions and create institutions of public beneficence by which present and future generations may profit. The ideal here presented, though not lofty, is certainly within easy apprehension, if not within as easy realization. How the just equilibrium between egoism and altruism which it inculcates is to be obtained M. Demolins does not, so far as we have noticed, explicitly state. Doubtless he would say that it is just here that religion must exert its influence. In this as in many of his opinions and arguments we readily agree with him.

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS, 1493-1803.

The Arthur H. Clark Company, Cleveland O., announce in a limited edition, an extensive, and unusually important literary undertaking—an historical series entitled “The Philippine Islands, 1493-1803: Explorations by Early Navigators, Descriptions of the Islands and Their Peoples, Their History, and Records of the Catholic Missions, as related in contemporaneous books and manuscripts, showing the political, economic, commercial, and religious conditions of those islands from their earliest relations with European Nations to the beginning of the nineteenth century,” in fifty-five volumes, the first of which will appear about January 15, 1903. This work will present (mainly in English translation) the most important printed works, to the year 1803, including a great number of heretofore unpublished MSS., which have been gathered from various foreign archives and libraries, principally from Spain, Portugal, France, England, Italy, Mexico, Japan, the Philippines, etc. The manuscripts which have been known to a very few scholars only, and have been very difficult heretofore to study, are of great importance at the present time.

The series will be edited and annotated by Miss Emma Helen Blair, A. M., of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, assistant editor of *The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents*, and James Alexander Robertson, Ph. B., also formerly engaged upon that work. An historical introduction and notes are furnished by Edward Gaylord Bourne, professor of history in Yale University, well known as an authority on early Spanish discoveries and colonization in the New World. The series will include a very careful and extensive

bibliography of Philippina—the most valuable that has yet appeared. There will also be an exhaustive, analytical index to the complete series.

The selection of documents to be published in this series has been made with special reference to the social and economic conditions of the islands under the Spanish régime, and to the history of the missions conducted therein by great religious orders of the Roman Catholic Church. The undertaking is commended by well known scholars, librarians, and ecclesiastics, and promises to be one of the most important literary events of this decade. The work will contain many illustrations of historical importance from Spanish and other originals, from manuscripts, etc. It will further be illustrated with modern and old maps, plans of cities, views, convents, architecture, etc. It will give for the first time in the English language the complete, original sources of our knowledge of these islands for over three centuries, and will thereby make accessible to scholars for the first time the books and manuscripts to which we must refer to get a clear and correct view of the social, economical, political, and religious state and history of the islands. Many important and almost unknown manuscripts now published for the first time will throw much new light on present conditions and on the inner history. The sources and authorities in every case will be carefully given, and the locations of rare Philippina in libraries at home and abroad will always be stated. The text will be carefully elucidated by notes, geographic, historical, ethnological, etc., and many contributions by well known scholars and specialists will be included.

This work is of great value and interest at the present time when a correct knowledge of the islands is absolutely necessary, and it will contain much of interest to students of Geography, Ethnology, Linguistics, Folklore, Comparative Religion, Ecclesiastic History, Administration, etc. The economic and commercial aspects will be given due attention, and it is the intention of the editors to make the work such that it will be highly welcome to librarians who are already seriously embarrassed in trying to meet the demand, in both reference and public libraries, for information relative to our Malaysian possessions—a demand which is increasing rapidly and must continue to increase.

A **DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE**. Dealing with its Language, Literature and Contents, including the Biblical Theology. Edited by James Hastings, M. A., D. D. Vol. IV. Pleroma-Zuzim. Royal 8vo., pp. 994. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

This volume completes the Dictionary proper as announced, but another is to be added containing indexes and certain subsidiary matter that is considered important. Now that the book has been

completed it is not inappropriate to recall the scope of the work as outlined in the beginning. It was thus stated:

"It is an encyclopædic dictionary of the Old and New Testaments, together with the Old Testament apocrypha, according to the authorized and revised English versions. It is believed that in no other similar work can the student or reader obtain such scope and fulness, such absolute accuracy and authoritativeness of interpretation, and such convenience and accessibility. The comprehensive aim of this dictionary is to define all the words in the Bible not self-explanatory."

We are sorry that we cannot subscribe to all of this, but the *absolute accuracy*, and *authoritativeness* of interpretation, and the *scope* and *fulness* are more than we can admit. If the book were called a Protestant Bible Dictionary, or if accuracy, authoritativeness, scope and fulness were claimed from a Protestant point of view only, we should admit the claim, but we cannot admit it without limitation. As we have already pointed out in the *Quarterly* when reviewing former volumes, Catholic interpretation of texts which are subjects of controversy is either altogether ignored or passed over lightly. There are many instances of this in former volumes; there are several in the volume before us. This quotation from the article on "Priest" will serve as an illustration:

"The New Testament does not apply the word *ιερεὺς* to any Christian minister, nor indeed to any minister at all, except so far as the people of God are spoken of as a royal priesthood. It is easy to see why Christianity is what it is—a perfect and abiding fellowship with God—because it is realized in the Eternal Son of God. It cannot be realized or guaranteed in any other. He is the Mediator of it to whom it owes its character. To introduce into it, no matter how we define their relation to Him, *official* mediators, is to relapse from the Melchizedek priesthood to the Aaronic; it is in principle to apostatize from Christianity. The pictorial use of language borrowed from the old religion is, of course, intelligible enough. . . . But there is not, as in the nature of the case there could not be, any trace in the New Testament of a Christian priest making sacrifice for sin, and mediating again between God and man."

In the article on "Sacrifice," after quoting the doctrine of the Church as defined by the Council of Trent in regard to the Sacrifice of the Mass, and we are grateful for the quotation, although it is brief, the writer says:

"It would be out of place to develop the general objections to this view, which involves the grave religious defect of suggesting that salvation rests on an incomplete and therefore insecure foundation. The relevant objections are that the tenet of transubstantiation,

which is the presupposition of the theory, has no scriptural warrant, while the interpretation of the Eucharist as a perpetual propitiatory offering is inconsistent with the New Testament teaching that the sacrifice of Christ was expiatory, and was offered once for all."

Under the heading "Power of the Keys" we are informed that: "The binding and loosing are not, in this case any more than elsewhere to be interpreted as the absolving and retaining of sins; they seem to mean the prescribing what the offender is to do and not to do."

These quotations will be sufficient to show that Catholic belief and practice get but scant courtesy in this latest Encyclopædic Dictionary which claims to have such absolute accuracy and authoritativeness of interpretation. A work that makes such claims ought to live up to them. Moreover, may we not reasonably suspect that the writers for this Dictionary who through ignorance or prejudice act unfairly in regard to Catholic matters, will be unreliable in regard to other matters?

It is not our purpose to try to detract from the many excellencies of the work, but we feel bound in justice to call the attention of Catholic students to the complexion of a book which so openly tries to destroy Penance, the Holy Eucharist, the Sacrifice of the Mass, and the Priesthood in one volume.

THE FAITH OF OLD ENGLAND. A Popular Manual of Instructions in the Catholic Faith from a Doctrinal and Historical Standpoint. By the *Rev. Vincent Hornyold, S. J.* 12mo., pp. xi.—191. London: Catholic Truth Society.

Here is an excellent addition to the many useful publications of the London Truth Society. These publications are rapidly covering the whole field of Catholic doctrine, history and worship in brief but comprehensive form. They may well be compared to grains of seed, small and sometimes almost insignificant in form, but which bear fruit a hundred-fold. The volume before us is more pretentious in form, and wider in scope than many that have preceded it, but it is marked by the general characteristics of all the publications of the Society: it is clear, concise, convincing.

The author begins with this graceful apology and explanation:

"There are many manuals of instructions in the Catholic faith already in circulation, some one may say; why then add to their number?

"My reply is simple. If the book exists which would meet the needs of the class of enquirers I have before my mind, I have not been fortunate enough to come across it.

"I should wish to have a manual of instructions written in the

simplest language, yet not too elementary to satisfy an enquiring mind, and of a price to place it within reach of all.

"I should like to have arguments drawn from Scripture, the Councils of the Church, and the teaching of the early Christian writers, all doing their part, while history retained its proper place. It must tell us its sad yet soul-stirring story of the love of our forefathers for the faith which had been brought to them from Rome; it must show how it came about that England was forced into schism, and how, as a nation, she fell away from the Truth.

"How few know anything of the persecution undergone with such unostentatious heroism by English Catholics for three hundred years and more! Surely the better we realize how cruel were the measures adopted to stamp out the Faith in Old England, the more we shall love and value the heirloom which has been handed down at the cost of so much suffering.

"Then, again, I should wish to find included in such a work as I have in view, a brief exposition of the principal doctrines and practices of the Catholic faith; for I know that in the case of some—perhaps I ought to say of many—difficulties arise where there is question of purchasing two or three books which may be required to cover the necessary ground.

"Last, but not least, certain questions which—however useful in time gone by—at the present day rarely come under discussion, might be expected to make place for others that are agitating the minds of non-Catholics, and especially of the members of the High Church party; many of whom, dissatisfied with the claims of the Anglican Establishment to form part of the Catholic Church, are groping in the dark after truth."

No one will deny that there is a demand for such a manual. All priests who have instructed non-Catholics must have experienced the difficulty of placing in their hands the right book. There is no question of *books*, but *a* book. We do not believe it is possible to make every stage of progress, but we know nothing better of its size than the volume before us for intelligent persons who believe in revealed religion, and want to find the Church of God.

DE DEO UNO ET TRINO: Disputationes Theologicæ in Iam Partem D. Thomæ, Qu. ii., XLIII. Auctore *Josepho M. Piottrelli, S. J.* Neapoli, Michael D'Auria, 1902.

The author of this work is well known to professional students of scholastic divinity through his profound *Disputationes Metaphysicæ de Deo* which was published in Paris some twenty years ago. The present work carries forward and develops on the plane of theology

the purely philosophical truths of its predecessor. The extraordinary bulk of the volume—comprising over fourteen hundred small quarto pages—may seem in these days of manuals and primers to call for an apology. Even the most ardent courtier of the “queen of science” must have some leisure for other duties and the varied demands of life—to say nothing of other studies and to leave in the dim distance the urgency of the newspaper and the latest novel. But how to husband time and energy, physical as well as psychological, so as to satisfy those claims and still find a residue for the study required to do justice to so profound and broad a treatment of the most difficult subject of theology may well be considered a difficult problem of private economy. The author has not overlooked at least his responsibility for the insistence of the difficulty; and so he reassures the student at the start by observing that some three hundred pages of the work are occupied by the text of the forty-two corresponding questions reprinted from the *Summa Theologica* of St. Thomas and about one hundred more pages by supplementary citations from the other works of the Angelic Doctor. Thus about a thousand pages alone are given to the *Commentary*, an amount of matter usually covered by a year’s study in the higher schools of Divinity. Accepting this arithmetical explanation of the volume’s goodly proportions the serious student will not regard it in the light of an apology, for he realizes that only in quartos and folios can the vast truths of theology receive a just presentation and development. St. Thomas must have felt sensibly the restrictions he placed, not on himself so much as on the large truths of theology by endeavoring to condense them into the *Summa*. Doubtless it would have been a special joy to him could he have foreseen that his devoted followers would liberate those truths from their limited environment and bring them forth into the broad air and sunlight which only the ample space of tomes such as Father Piccerelli knows how to construct can afford them. It has been a prudent thought on his part to have reprinted with his own commentary the corresponding text of St. Thomas. The student’s convenience is thus consulted and his personal contact with the works of the Angelic Doctor ensured. The author’s regard for his readers’ accommodation is further evidenced by the copious analytic index by which the immense wealth of argument and reference is brought under a ready survey. The large clear letter press, moreover, is a feature for which the reader of a book of this kind will not be ungrateful.

For the rest our spatial limitations do not permit us to set forth the author’s theological opinions. Besides, they appeal only to the special student of theology and he will want to read them for himself. Suffice it to note that an effort throughout is apparent to re-

flect the full mind of St. Thomas. The controversies of the schools are given their full measure of justice, quantitative and qualitative. Though Thomistic the author, it need hardly be said, is not a Thomist.

HISTOIRE DE LIVRES DU N. TESTAMENT. Par E. Jacquier. Tome I., pp. xii., 491. Paris, 1903. Victor Lecoffre, Rue Bonaparte 90. Price, 3½ francs.

The present volume forms part of an extensive series of special studies entitled a *Library of Ecclesiastical History*. The design of the series is to furnish professors, students and educated Catholics generally with a collection of works dealing with subjects of special importance in the history of the Church, that shall be abreast with the progress of modern criticism. The aim is not to provide manuals of instruction nor popular historical narratives, but to furnish instruments of higher education in accordance with the views expressed by Leo XIII. on historical studies. Thus far six volumes of the *Library* have appeared: *Christianity and the Roman Empire*, by M. Paul Allard; *Ancient Christian Literature*, the Greek by Mgr. Batiffol and the Syriac by M. Duval; the *Great Schism of the West*, by M. Salembier; the *Church and the Beginnings of the Renaissance*, by M. Guiraud, and lastly the present *History of the Books of the New Testament*, by M. Jacquier. That these monographs supply a demand may in some degree be inferred from the multiplied editions into which they have already passed. That the latest accession is quite up to the grand excellence of its predecessor will doubtless be attested by similar external evidence, and no prolonged perusal of the book will be needed to provide the internal evidence to the same effect. The controlling purpose of the work is to place the Books of the New Testament in their original historical and doctrinal environment. To this end the philosophical and especially the religious ideas of their authors, the intellectual and social conditions of the readers for whom they wrote, and the events which occasioned their writing are described. This necessitated setting forth the arguments for the authenticity of the original documents, an analysis of their contents, and a special exposition of their directive ideas. The order of development does not follow that of the contents of the New Testament. It is chronological. The Epistles of St. Paul, the dates of which are more exactly known, are alone dealt with in the present volume. The synoptic Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the Catholic Epistles and the Johannine writings are to be treated in a subsequent volume. The main body of the work is introduced by discussions on the Chronology and Language of the New Testament. The study of the Pauline Epistles is preceded by

a biography of their author. The Letters to the Thesalonians are assigned to the first place and are followed in order by those to the Corinthians, Galatians, and Romans. Those to the Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon and the Philippians are ascribed to the time of St. Paul's captivity. The Pastoral Epistles (to Titus and Timothy) and the Epistle to the Hebrews are given the subsequent places. At the head of each chapter a bibliography is given containing the most important books—especially the more recent and fully developed. Besides this a brief supplement contains a short bibliography of general works and of those relating especially to St. Paul. Nothing therefore is wanting as regards the apparatus for a thorough study of the subject matter. One who reads the present volume will be eager for the coming of its companion, in which the rest of the New Testament books will be dealt with.

SERMONS FOR ALL THE SUNDAYS OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL YEAR, AND THE PRINCIPAL FESTIVALS. For the use of Parish Priests and for Private Reading. By *Rev. George Deshon*, of the Paulist Fathers. Cloth, 500 pages, \$1.00. Catholic Book Exchange, 120 West Sixtieth Street, New York.

Father Deshon cannot be accused of rushing into print. All that he says is the result of the experience of a long, active life well spent in the service of God. He has put to the test the material that he presents to younger workmen, and he knows its value. He cannot possibly be moved by the vanity that might influence a younger man, without perhaps his knowledge. Only the best motives influence him to mount a higher pulpit from which he can reach a larger audience, as advancing years render it more difficult for him to speak from the old platform.

But hear him as to his purpose :

"In preparing these Sermons, as far as I am able to judge, I have endeavored to forget myself, and aimed only at the good of my hearers.

"I have tried to use simple and straightforward language, so as to be clearly and easily understood ;

"To give a higher idea of the power, wisdom and goodness of God, our Creator, and our nothingness as creatures ;

"Of the immensity and glorious character of the eternal destiny prepared for us, and the dreadful consequences of our failure to attain it ;

"To magnify the goodness of God in redeeming us, and His readiness to give us abundant graces to help us to attain it ;

"To explain that the essence of religion does not consist in sentiment and feeling, but in a sincere obedience ;

"That the road of obedience is not too difficult, but as our Saviour says, 'easy and light' to all who are well disposed ;

"To inspire a generous enthusiasm to keep the commandments, not only in the letter, but also in the spirit ;

"That each one in his own state of life should ardently desire to conform himself in all things to the will of God as far as he can ascertain it."

One who knows the preacher better than we shall speak for him :

"What makes these sermons especially attractive is their direct and practical bearing on the life of souls. Father Deshon is an old missionary, and has had a life-long experience both in preaching and directing souls, and these sermons are the best flowering of his life's work. There is, moreover, about them a quaint mystical flavor that comes from an intimate acquaintance with the old writers of ascetical theology.

"Most priests find a sermon that stimulates their own thoughts the only one of value. To have this stimulating quality a sermon must have an original character, and there must be about it a certain attractive flavor of simplicity and directness. Father Deshon's sermons possess these qualities in a most eminent degree."

DISCOURSES DOCTRINAL AND MORAL. By the *Most Rev. Dr. McEvilly*, Archbishop of Tuam. 8vo., pp. 382. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The Venerable Archbishop of Tuam is a striking example of the truth, that the busiest man does most work. Notwithstanding the many exacting demands made upon him by his manifold routine duties, he finds time in the midst of distractions to devote to literary work. His commentaries on certain books of the Sacred Scriptures are well known and highly valued. Those who have learned the merits of that work will be particularly interested in the present work. It is a collection of seventy-five sermons preached at different times and on several occasions. They were written to be preached and not to be published. Not until his friends had repeatedly requested it did he at last consent to their publication. He thus states his purpose :

"Should they help in any way in the salvation of souls, by arousing the sinner to a sense of his sadly degraded condition, and converting him from the evil of his ways, aided by the all powerful grace of God ; and serve to stimulate the just, to advance steadily and perseveringly in the road of Christian perfection, thus contributing to the glory of God, and small trouble undergone in connection with

them will not be undertaken in vain, and shall thus be amply repaid.

"We have had in view, in their publication, to remedy, in some measure, a great defect connected with most of the sermons with which the world is flooded, especially those imported from abroad. That defect is the absence of scriptural quotations and especially their appropriate application.

"This is the more to be deplored, as nothing imparts such strength to a sacred discourse, nothing so appropriate, nothing so acceptable to the hearers, nothing so calculated to bring a blessing on the labors of a preacher, as the appropriate quotation of the Word of God Himself.

"Now it is humbly hoped this glaring defect may to a certain extent be remedied in the following discourses."

This lack of Scriptural quotation is a pretty general evil, and Archbishop McEvilly does well to call attention to it. His sermons abound with quotations from the Bible and the Fathers that lend a special value to them. The frequent references to doctrinal matter will fit the reader with replies to the errors of the day and enable him on occasion to meet the attacks of unbelievers. The subjects treated include Death, Judgment, Heaven, Hell, Sin, Prayer, the Lord's Prayer, the Hail Mary, Catholic Education, and the principal feasts. They are full of character and worthy of publication.

COMPENDIUM THEOLOGIÆ MORALIS, a Joanne Petro Gury, S. J., Conscriptum et ab Antonio Ballerini, Einsdem Societatis, adnotationibus auctum, deinde vero ad breviorē formam exaratum atque ad usum Seminariorum Huius Regionis Accomodatum ab Aloysio Sabetti, S. J., in Collegio Woodstockiensi, Md., Theologiæ Moralis Professor. Editio Decima Sexta Recognita a Timotheo Barrett, S. J. 8vo., pp. 904. New York: Pustet & Co.

The first edition of this excellent book came from the press in 1884; now we have the sixteenth before us. This were proof sufficient of the excellence of the work. It has retained its popularity with no change in the text, except what was rendered necessary by decrees of the Roman Congregations, although many other manuals of moral theology, by distinguished and learned authors, have in the meantime made tempting bids for popular favor. Sabetti's Moral Theology is so well known that it might seem superfluous to speak of it in detail, and yet so long a time has elapsed since its first appearance, so many other manuals have followed it, and it does so admirably all that is claimed for it that we shall describe briefly its plan and scope as set forth by the author. It is a compendium of Gury's Moral Theology reduced to a new and shorter form, and adapted to the necessities and customs of this country. The excellence of Gury enriched with the notes of Ballerini was

sufficient to restrain the author from making an altogether new manual, but he found the notes so numerous as to be confusing, and therefore he omitted annotations altogether, embodying in the text the more important and necessary ones.

Moreover, all those parts of Gury which are limited in application to other countries and are of no practical use here, have been eliminated. In their place, matter drawn from our Plenary Councils and other approved sources has been inserted. This course insures a practical manual, since Moral Theology consists to a great extent in practical applications and must take on a certain diversity and local character according to the country for which it is written.

Father Sabetti has gotten rid of much antiquated matter by introducing the Constitution "Apostolicae Sedis" and the most recent decrees of the Roman Congregations.

In one respect especially the author has enlarged on Gury. The latter gives small space to "Probability," and "Equal Probably;" Father Sabetti devotes more attention to them, not in a controversial spirit, but to bring out more clearly the teaching of the master St. Alphonsus on these important subjects.

The author's whole purpose may be summed up in this way: to make a short practical manual of Moral Theology for seminarians and priests leading the active life of the mission. He has succeeded admirably. In practice the theologian will almost always find a sufficient answer in this book for all difficulties. It is in truth a manual.

SYNOPSIS THEOLOGIE MORALIS ET PASTORALIS, ad mentem S. Thomæ et S. Alphonsi, Hodiernis moribus accommodata. T. 1.—De Pœnitentia, Matrimonio et Ordine. Auctore Ad. Tanquerey, S. S. 8vo., pp. xxiii., 661. Neo-Eboraci: Fratres Benziger.

Students of theology will be glad to learn that Father Tanquerey has begun the publication of a work on moral theology. His dogma rapidly made its way into favor, and those who are acquainted with its unusual merits will have a special welcome for this work on morals by the same author.

In the present work he tells us that he does not confine himself to casuistry, but that he treats of morals in a doctrinal and speculative way also. Even pastoral theology is included in the work, to some extent.

St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Alphonsus are the chief guides. After them come Suarez, De Lugo and Billuart, and among the most recent authors, Carriere, Lehmkuhl, Müller and Ballerini are quoted. The author is unusually clear. The language is easy, the divisions and subdivisions are helpful, the statement of different opinions brief and fair, and the conclusion logical and practical.

Many authors, even very learned ones, gather together an array of authorities that simply bewilders the average student, and after pitting them against one another, singly and in groups, like combatants in the arena, until they become one struggling mass, leave the spectator to make peace, and decide the merits of the case for himself. Now this is precisely what the average student cannot do, and should not be asked to do. There is too much speculation in most manuals, and not enough practice. Father Tanquerey is making a practical book. One which the seminarian can use to fit him for the mission, and one which the priest can use as a daily hand book.

Two distinctive features of the work are, that it is up to date, and that it is adapted to the conditions of this country. Two peculiarities of it are that the civil law of Matrimony is treated in an appendix, and that the treatment of questions "de Impotentia, de Debito Conjugali," and "de Baptizandis Foetibus," is reserved for a Supplement. The book is excellent from a material point of view. The paper, type, and binding are most inviting. We recommend it without reservation.

ONWARD AND UPWARD: a Year Book, compiled from the Discourses of Archbishop Keane. By *Maurice Francis Egan*. 12mo., pp. 387. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co.

The compiler thus states the purpose of the book: "The main object of this book is, in the view of the compiler, to give to earnest men and women, often too busy for long meditation, a spiritual keynote for each day in the year. And Archbishop Keane knows our country and the human heart, our conditions and our struggles and temptations so well, that from the work of no other man could be drawn sentiments at once so spiritual and so practical, so stimulating and so sustaining for the great mass of the American people."

The volume is divided into twelve parts corresponding to the twelve months of the year. There is a page for each day of each month. On each page is printed an extract from some discourse of the Archbishop. All the extracts for each month treat of one subject, so that they are all grouped under twelve headings. These are: Right Living, Religion, Home, Education, The Ideal Woman, The Ideal Man, Civilization, America, Progress, Art, Brotherhood, Death and Resurrection.

It will be seen at a glance that these are all important subjects, and timely ones. Those who have heard the learned author speak on them know how clearly and forcibly he always expresses himself. He has the essential quality of a public speaker and writer which is very often wanting, clearness.

Perhaps the strongest group of selections in the book is made up of those which treat of "Brotherhood." It may be they strike the reader more forcibly because of their peculiar fitness to the times when misunderstandings between employer and employe are more frequent, when strikes are commoner, and when socialistic tendencies are more widespread. It would certainly do great good if these declarations on the subject could be placed in the hands of the contending parties.

CARMINA MARIANA. Second Series. An English Anthology in Verse in honor of and in relation to the Blessed Virgin Mary. Collected and arranged by Orby Shipley, M. A. Second Edition. 12mo., pp. liv., 500. London: Burns & Oates.

When the First Series of *Carmina Mariana* appeared every one was surprised at the extent and variety of the poetic tributes to our Blessed Lady and through her to the mystery of the Incarnation. As a writer in the *Spectator* said: "It is important as a witness to the marvelous agreement, through vast periods full of change in recognition of the Mother of Christ. Readers of Catholic prayer books are sometimes startled by the varied epithets applied to her. This book is witness that in none of them sanctioned in Catholic practice, is there novelty of respect. It seems certain that the Christian Church of East and West accepted, rather than imposed, the cult which the common reverence of Catholics spontaneously and logically offered."

The words of praise poured out in praise of the collection were abundant and universal. We feel sure that the Second Series will be as warmly welcomed. It is fully equal to the First in extent, variety and general excellence.

It was most desirable that this good work which was postponed so long should at last be done completely, and all those interested in the work will rejoice that the same loving editorial hand has guided the Second Series safely into the light. They will rejoice still more to learn that he is now engaged on the Third and last Series. When this has appeared we shall probably have the most complete collection of verse on any one subject in the English language or any other language.

Catholics should rejoice in this triumph of their dear Mother, and encourage the learned author by subscribing for his books.

BENZIGER'S MAGAZINE. An Illustrated Catholic Monthly. Folio pp. 50 each number. \$2.00 a year. New York: Benziger Brothers.

Benziger Brothers are succeeding in producing a first class Catholic Illustrated Magazine. We had already the *Catholic World*, *Donahue's* and the *Messenger*, all excellent in their way, but not

intended to fill the same want that Benziger's Magazine supplies. It is essentially a family magazine, not intended to supplement secular publications of the same kind, but to supplant them. This was really necessary, because none of the secular magazines are altogether safe in the family circle. Some offend oftener and more flagrantly than others, but they all offend frequently enough to require expunging. It may be a story, or part of a story; it may be a poem, it may be a picture, or perhaps only an advertisement, but the poison is none the less dangerous because hidden. We could not be expected to go through our magazines with scissors in hand to excise them before giving them to our children, and hence the need of a Catholic magazine which would take their place. One with all their good features, and none of their bad ones. Such a book must contain all the departments of interest furnished by the secular magazines which appeal to the different members of the household, with the best illustrations and yet be Catholic in tone. Such a book Benziger Brothers are making.

It is like Harper's and Collier's in form, and the large folio pages give excellent opportunities for large illustrations. It was a very serious undertaking, requiring great outlay and much risk, and therefore the publishers deserve the more credit and better support. If sample copies could be placed in every Catholic household in the land, we feel sure that the circulation would be rapidly and enormously increased.

Six months' subscription may be purchased for one dollar.

HISTORIC HIGHWAYS OF AMERICA. Vol. I., *Paths of the Mound-Building Indians and Great Game Animals.* Vol. II., *Indian Thoroughfares.* By *Archer Butler Hulbert.* With Maps and Illustrations. 8vo., pp. 140 and 152. Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Co.

These two volumes are the first and second of a series of sixteen on the History of America as portrayed in the evolution of its highways of War, Commerce, and Social Expansion. "The more important highways will be specifically treated with reference to the national needs which they temporarily or permanently satisfied. The study of any highway for itself alone might prove of indifferent value; but the story of a road, which shows clearly the rise, nature, and passing of a nation's need for it, is of great importance."

"Part one of the first volume treats of the distribution of the mound-building Indians, and the evidence that the earliest Red Men found and opened the great land thoroughfares on the watersheds of America. The second part treats of the range and habits of the great game animal—the buffalo."

The second volume, which deals with Indian thoroughfares, is

particularly interesting, because in it the author has given the first public record of explorations which have made him the authority on this branch of archæology. The inexperienced reader will be surprised to learn that Indian trails which appear to be wandering paths leading directly to no particular point, in reality cover the country with a network, and lead by the straightest practicable courses to all strategic points.

This volume contains the result of years of study of the pioneer period. This interesting and valuable contribution to the history of the country will be confined to a limited edition printed directly from type, which will be immediately distributed. The work is sold in sets only, and it will be necessary for those who wish to possess it to order promptly. It is expected that a new volume will appear every two months.

RELATION DE TERRE SAINTE (1533-1534) PAR GREFFIN AFFAGART, publiée avec une introduction et des notes par *J. Chavanon*, archiviste paléographe, correspondant du Ministère de l'Instruction publique. Paris: Victor Lecoffre, 90 rue Bonaparte. 1902. I. Vol. illustré de xxvii., 245 pages. Prix, 5 francs.

This volume contains the narrative, now published for the first time, of a pilgrimage made to the Holy Places by a French gentleman in the sixteenth century, in company with a learned Franciscan, Rev. Father Brochard. In preparing this account M. Chavanon has been at great pains to follow carefully the sole remaining manuscript.

A lengthy preface introduces the author and his work. The text is accompanied with notes, critical, historical and geographical, and obsolete terms are fully explained. Further, an artistic character is given to the edition by illustrations borrowed from the most celebrated works on the Holy Land of the same epoch as the narrative itself and by two new phototypes of Cyprus.

As a result we have a fine work, instructive and at the same time edifying—a work that all who are interested in Biblical studies and the Holy Land, and more generally all who enjoy picturesque narratives of the travels of a former age, should possess.

PRACTICAL EXPLANATION AND APPLICATION OF BIBLE HISTORY. Edited by Rev. John J. Nash, D. D. 8vo., pp. 518. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The reverend author tells us his purpose by quoting Cardinal Vaughan's commendation of Knecht's Commentary, which runs thus: "To show in what ways the Inspired Writings are of practical use to Christian life, to mark their application to conduct as they are perused by the youthful reader, is to render a great service to our Holy Religion."

He has translated and edited Siegel's "Katechetischer Leitfaden,"

and has followed the lines laid down in that work. He has, however, pruned the original and added some things which he hopes will make it interesting and practical. The work is intended for catechism teachers, and is arranged entirely in questions and answers. These are not supposed to exhaust the subject, but rather to suggest fuller thought. The principal merit claimed for the work is the practical application at the close of each chapter.

MARIE CORONA. Chapters on the Mother of God and His Saints. By the *Rev. P. A. Sheehan, D. D.*, author of "My New Curate," "Luke Delmege," and other works. 12mo., pp. 200. New York: Benziger Brothers. Dublin: Catholic Truth Society.

Of the twelve chapters in the book five treat of the Blessed Virgin under the titles: "Morning Star," "Tower of Ivory," "Glory of Israel," "Mother of God" and "Queen of Saints." The other chapters are devoted to St. Augustine, St. Joseph, SS. Peter and Paul, St. Patrick, St. Dominic, St. Teresa, St. Alphonsus and St. Aloysius. They are beautifully written and are full of devotion and learning. They may be used for spiritual reading, and would serve excellently without alteration for sermons or lectures. The Catholic Truth Society of Ireland is to be commended for inducing Father Sheehan to put into type what had remained in manuscript too long.

"THE SAINTS"—Saint Dominic. By *Jean Guiraud*. Translated by Katharine de Mattos. 12mo., pp. 194. London: Duckworth & Co. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This latest addition to the series which has been appearing in French and English under the direction of M. Joly, possesses all the charm and merit of each of its predecessors. The picture true to life framed by the historical events that accompanied the person is again reproduced in simple, but clear language, and brief but comprehensive form. This series is gradually filling the place which it began to occupy in the beginning, and it will have a permanent value that will probably last indefinitely.

SERMONS FROM THE LATINS. Adapted from Bellarmine, Segneri and Other Sources. By *Rev. James J. Baxter, D. D.* 12mo., pp. 618. New York: Benziger Brothers.

This book contains a sermon for each Sunday in the year, and for some of the principal feasts. The reverend author tells us that he has not translated the sermons from Latin writers verbatim, but that from a study of these authors he has constructed a series of sermons. He has followed principally Cardinal Bellarmin's "Consciones Sacrae."

BOOKS RECEIVED.

- TRACES OF ELDER FAITHS OF IRELAND: a Folklore Sketch. A Handbook of Irish Pre-Christian Traditions. By *W. G. Wood-Martin, M. R. I. A.*, Author of "Pagan Ireland," "The Lake Dwellings of Ireland," etc. With numerous illustrations. Two volumes. 8vo., pp. xii., 405, and xii., 438. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.
- DE FIDE DIVINA, Libri Quatuor. Auctore *Gulielmo Wilmers, S. J.* Opus Postumum post mortem auctoris editum cura Augustini Lehmkuhl, S. J. 8vo., pp. 415. Neo Eboraci: Fredericus Pustet.
- RECOLLECTIONS OF HALF A CENTURY. By *Colonel Alexander K. McClure*. 8vo., pp. 502. Illustrated. Salem Press Co., Salem, Mass.
- EARTH TO HEAVEN. By *Monsignor John S. Vaughan*, Domestic Prelate of Leo XIII. Author of "Life After Death," "Thoughts for All Times," "Faith and Folly," etc. 8vo., pp. xiv., 184. St. Louis: B. Herder.
- POLITICAL AND MORAL ESSAYS. By *Joseph Rickaby, S. J.*, B. Sc. Oxon. 12mo., pp. 298. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- THE MIRROR OF PERFECTION. Being a Record of St. Francis of Assisi ascribed to His Companion Brother Leo of Assisi, and now translated by Constance, Countess de La Warr, with an Introduction by Father Cuthbert, O. S. F. C. London: Burns & Oates. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- THE CONVENTS OF GREAT BRITAIN. By *Francesca M. Steele* (Darley Dale). With a Preface by Father Thurston, S. J. 12mo., pp. xxv., 320, with numerous portraits. St. Louis: B. Herder.
- LETTERS TO YOUNG MEN. By *Henri Dominique Lacordaire*, of the Order of Friars Preachers. New Edition revised and enlarged. 12mo., pp. xiv., 236. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- THOUGHTS ON EDUCATION. Speeches and Sermons by *Mandell Creighton, D. D., D. C. L., LL. D.*, etc. Edited by Louise Creighton. 12mo., pp. xii., 215. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.
- NEW AND COMPLETE ENGLISH-GERMAN AND GERMAN-ENGLISH POCKET DICTIONARY, with the Pronunciation of both Languages, enriched with the technical terms of the Arts and Sciences. By *J. F. L. and L. H. Tafel*. 16mo, pp. 874. Philadelphia: John J. McVey.
- IN THE DAYS OF KING HAL. By *Marion Ames Taggart*. 12mo., pp. 172. Illustrated. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- THE DEATH OF SIR LAUNCELOT, and Other Poems. By *Ovide Benoit Pallen*. 12mo., pp. 124. Boston: Small, Maynard & Co.
- A MARTYR OF THE MOHAWK VALLEY and Other Poems. By *P. J. Coleman*. 12mo., pp. 132. New York: Messenger Press, 27 West Sixteenth street.
- A ROUND TABLE OF THE REPRESENTATIVE CATHOLIC GERMAN NOVELISTS. With Portraits, Biographical Sketches and Bibliography. 12mo., pp. 235. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- THE HARMONY OF THE RELIGIOUS LIFE. By *Herman J. Heuser*, Overbrook Seminary. 12mo., pp. 247, with frontispiece. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- DE PERFECTIOE VITAE SPIRITUALIS, *R. P. Antonii Le Gaudier, S. J.* Editio recens emendata cura et studio P. A. M. Micheletti, S. J. Tom. I. Augustae Taurinorum (Turin), Typogr. P. Marietti. Londinum apud Thomas Baker, 1903. Pp. xiv., 604.
- TWENTY-FIVE PLAIN CATHOLIC SERMONS ON USEFUL SUBJECTS, with a Synopsis of Each Sermon. By *Father Clement Holland*. 12mo., pp. 422. Second Series. London: Thomas Baker.
- MANUAL OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE, Comprising Dogma, Moral and Worship. By a Seminary Professor. 12mo., pp. xiv., 587. Philadelphia: John J. McVey.
- FORTY-FIVE SERMONS, written to meet Objections of the Present Day. By *Rev. James McKernan*, of the Diocese of Trenton, N. J. 12mo., pp. 291. New York: Pustet & Co.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the *QUARTERLY* will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the *REVIEW* not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXVIII.—APRIL, 1903—No. 110.

ATTITUDE OF MODERN PROTESTANTS TOWARDS THE VIRGINITY OF OUR BLESSED LADY.

IT is with sentiments of pride and joy that we look back to the International Congress assembled in honor of Mary at Freiburg in Switzerland, August 18-21, 1902. Representatives from all parts of the Christian world bore witness to the unity of Catholic faith in the privileges of the great Mother of God, and to the intensity of devotion and love to our powerful patroness at the divine mercy-seat. According to a reliable estimate, more than eighteen thousand persons took part in the solemn procession which formed part of the external ceremonies of the Congress.¹ And it is with sentiments of longing and hope that we look forward to the honors which are to be paid to Our Blessed Lady in Rome, during the course of the year 1904, the fiftieth anniversary of the solemn definition of the dogma of Mary's Immaculate Conception.² But our joy and our hope are at times mingled with curiosity; we wish to know what impression our veneration of and devotion to Mary make on the Protestant world. It is strange indeed that while Catholics make every effort to honor Mary's Immaculate Conception and her glorious Assumption into Heaven, our Protestant contemporaries should wage a deadly battle—deadly only to themselves—against Mary's perpetual virginity. But we must not anticipate; nor must we charge all Protestants with enmity to Mary. In order

¹ Cf. *Etudes*, Oct. 5, 1902, p. 22-35.

² Cf. *Etudes*, May 20, 1902, p. 433-42.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1902, by P. J. Ryan, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

to understand the Protestant position more clearly, and to value their tenets at their proper worth, we shall first present an outline of the views advocated by acknowledged Protestant leaders, and then critically examine the arguments advanced by their most recent writer. In the first part, we shall follow the lead of Father L. Fonck,³ in the second we shall analyze the article "Mary" contributed by Professor Schmiedel to the *Encyclopædia Biblica*.⁴

I.

We trust that even now many Protestants agree with the reformer Œcolampadius⁵ in regarding opposition to Mary as the certain mark of a reprobate condition of mind; we know that there are several Protestant scholars who still defend the virginity of Mary as valiantly as did the Swiss reformer J. H. Bullinger.⁶ The eminent critic and scholar J. B. Lightfoot returns to the defense of this privilege of our Blessed Lady in several passages of his erudite works.⁷ Paul Feine shows against Holtzmann that modern opponents of Mary's virginity read the gospels in the light of a preconceived hypothesis; they see in this doctrine a gradual development of the Christian conception of Mary's exalted position, although history leaves no room for such a doctrinal evolution, seeing that the account of the infancy must have been written at the latest between 60 and 70 A. D.⁸ Alfred Plummer⁹ agrees with C. F. Nösgen¹⁰ in defending the authenticity and historical value of the gospel passages which refer to Mary's unspotted virginity. Alfred Resch¹¹ believes that if we compare the *Gospel of the Infancy* to a diamond set in rubies, the omis-

³ Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie, IV., 1901, p. 649-677.

⁴ Vol. III., 1902.

⁵ "Numquam de me, ut in Domino confido, audietur, quasi averser Mariam, erga quam minus bene affici reprobatae mentis certum existimem indicium" Œcolampadius, Sermo de laudando in Maria Deo; cf. Petr. Canisius, De Maria Virgine incomparabili, 1, 2; Ingolstadtii, 1577, p. 16.

⁶ Oportuit singulari et perpetua virginitate et puritate omnium selectissima illustrem et esse et permanere, quae singulariter electa a Deo in sacrosanctum Filii sui thalamum et templum, mater erat omnium sanctissimi partus, Filii utique Dei aeterni, futura," J. H. Bullinger, Sermo de Beata Virgine Maria; cf. Petr. Canisius, De Maria Virgine incomparabili et Dei Genitrice sacrosancta, 1, 2, Ingolstadtii, 1577, p. 16.

⁷ Essays on the work entitled Supernatural Religion, London, 1889, p. 235 f.; The Brethren of the Lord, in Dissertations on the Apostolic Age, London, 1892, p. 1-45; Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, London, 1892, p. 252-291.

⁸ Eine vorkanonische Überlieferung des Lukas, Gotha, 1891, p. 27-30.

⁹ A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke; International Commentary; Edinburgh, 1896, p. 6, 24.

¹⁰ Die Evangelien nach Matth., Mark und Lukas; Kurzgefasster Kommentar, München, 1897, p. 291 f.

¹¹ Das Kindheitsevangelium nach Lukas und Matthäus, Leipzig, 1897, p. 327 f.

sion of the apparitions of angels would be equivalent to the removal of the rubies, but the denial of the virgin birth would be like the destruction of the diamond itself. K. Endemann, too, has raised his voice in protest against Zahn's late attack on the perpetuity of Mary's virginity, and declared himself in favor of the Catholic view of the mystery.¹²

It must be confessed, however, that most Protestant scholars no longer agree with the school represented by the foregoing writers. The modern school rejects to a great extent even the divinity of Christ, and denies therefore almost of necessity the virginity of His Blessed Mother. Hermann Usener¹³ derives what he calls the legend of the virgin birth from pagan sources, seeing in it a Christian adaptation of certain parts of pagan mythology. H. J. Holtzmann¹⁴ considers all the gospel passages which imply Mary's virginity as later interpolations. Joh. Hillmann¹⁵ attempts to prove that the "redactor" is responsible for all the objectionable passages, i. e., for all the verses favoring Christ's miraculous conception and birth. Joh. Weiss,¹⁶ though not favorably impressed with Hillmann's theory, feels quite certain that the Judæo-Christian source of the third gospel knew nothing of the virgin birth. Both Hillmann and Joh. Weiss, therefore, agree with Usener in tracing the account of the miracle back to mythological sources. Adolf Harnack¹⁷ considers it as one of the most certain results of historical criticism that the words "born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary" formed no part of the original gospel teaching. P. Lobstein,¹⁸ though he is either not acquainted or not satisfied with the work of some of his predecessors, applies the principles of not merely the higher but the highest criticism to what he calls the myth of the virgin birth. F. Kattenbusch believes the main critical difficulty can be removed by the omission of the few words "because I know not man."

Meanwhile, H. J. Holtzmann, dissatisfied with his former solution of the problem, proposed a new way of removing the objectionable passage in Lk. i. 34 f.,¹⁹ but H. Weinel²⁰ pronounced Kattenbusch's

¹² Zur Frage über die Brüder des Herrn, in *Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr.*, ix., 1900, 833-865.

¹³ Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen I.: Das Weihnachtsfest, Bonn, 1889.

¹⁴ Hand-Commentar zum N. T., I., Freiburg, 1889, p. 31 f.

¹⁵ Die Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu nach Lukas kritisch untersucht, in *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie*, xvii., 1891, p. 192-261.

¹⁶ Bernh. Weiss und Lic. Joh. Weiss zu Luk. i., 34-39 in H. A. W. Meyer's *Krit.-exeget. Kommentar über das N. T.*, Göttingen, 1892, p. 302, 305.

¹⁷ Das Apostol. Glaubensbekenntniss, Berlin, 1892, p. 23 f.

¹⁸ Die Lehre von der übernatürlichen Geburt Christi, Freiburg, 1896, p. 27, 33, 36.

¹⁹ Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie I., Freiburg, 1897, p. 412 f.

²⁰ Die Auslegung des apostolischen Bekenntnisses von Kattenbusch und die neutestamentliche Forschung, in *Zeitschr. für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, II., 1901, 37-39.

theory the best way out of the difficulty. But even with all this, Adolf Harnack did not consider the spuriousness of Lk. i. 34 f. sufficiently established; he therefore summarized his own proofs against the authenticity of the passage in a paper contributed to the *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*,²¹ leaving it, however, doubtful whether the passage had been inserted by Luke himself or a later interpolator. Whatever effect Harnack's proofs may have produced on the circle of his own followers, they did not convince Adolf Hilgenfeld;²² this independent critic assigns the *whole* account of the birth and infancy of Jesus²³ to a later recension of the third gospel, and objects most decidedly against the practice of treating the above shorter passages in the narrative as interpolations. Still, while this eminent scholar answers most of Harnack's arguments quite satisfactorily, he agrees with Harnack, and with Lobstein too, in deriving the so-called myth of the virgin birth from a false interpretation of Is. vii., 14, current in early Judæo-Christian circles.

Of late, Ludw. Conrady²⁴ has come to the conclusion that the history of the infancy has been derived from Egyptian mythology; he believes that it passed into our gospels through the medium of the *Protevangelium Jacobi*, an apocryphal work written by a good-natured Christian poet in Alexandria, about 120 A. D. But Conrady found out to his sorrow that our professional higher critics are as averse to any theory that outrages common sense too much as they are impatient of any view which agrees too closely with the dictates of sound reason. Hence representatives of as different critical tendencies as Ernst von Dobschütz,²⁵ H. J. Holtzmann²⁶ and J. Hillmann²⁷ agree in disagreeing with Conrady's explanation of the account of the virgin birth. But the end is not yet. Theod. Zahn, of Erlangen, a scholar well known for his conservative tendencies,²⁸ and Professor F. A. C. Sieffert, of Bonn,²⁹ have refurbished the old weapon so often and so ineffectually wielded against Mary's perpetual virginity. They again appeal to the brethren of Jesus in order to show that Mary cannot have remained a virgin at least after giving birth to our Lord.

²¹ II., 1901, 53-57.

²² Die Geburt Jesu aus der Jungfrau in dem Lukasevangelium, in Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theologie, xli., 1901, p. 313-317.

²³ Lk. i., 5-11., 52.

²⁴ Die Quelle der kanonischen Kindheitsgeschichte Jesus'; ein wissenschaftlicher Versuch; Göttingen, 1900.

²⁵ Lit. Centralblatt, li., 1900, 2153 f.

²⁶ Theol. Literaturztg., xxvi., 1901, 135-137.

²⁷ Deutsche Literaturztg., xxii., 1901, 1005-1007.

²⁸ Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altchristlichen Literatur, vi., 2, Brüder und Vetter Jesu, p. 225-372; Leipzig, 1900.

²⁹ Jacobus im N. T. in Realencycl. für prot. Theol. u. Kirche, 3 ed., viii., Leipzig, 1900.

It is clear from the foregoing list of writers and views, that we cannot in a paper like the present deal with all opponents of the virginity of our Blessed Lady. Some of them have been sufficiently refuted by such scholars as Professor O. Bardenhewer,³⁰ M. J. Lagrange³¹ and L. Fonck.³² And to slay the slain is not merely superfluous from an apologetic point of view, but also useless as far as the history of controversy is concerned; for the trend of argument is practically the same in all our opponents' writings on the present question. If we therefore examine into the argument of the most recent representative of the critical school, we shall at the same time analyze a fair specimen of the fallacies of higher criticism and become acquainted with a solid method of avoiding them.

II.

Professor Paul W. Schmiedel, of Zürich, has contributed to the *Encyclopædia Biblica*³³ an article on Mary. It consists of twenty-two paragraphs: the first two are devoted to a study of the name *Mary*, the last contains the bibliography of the subject, the three preceding the last treat of the life of Mary, of her character, and of the later traditions concerning her person and history, while the intermediate sixteen paragraphs treat of Mary's virginity. One has reason to feel surprised at the want of proportion in the make up of the article, but one is positively shocked at the contents of the closing portions. Among the later traditions, the scurrilous blasphemies of the Talmud and of Celsus seem to be placed on the same level with the sayings of St. Justin and St. Irenæus. When describing the character of Mary the writer feels "on firm ground" only in the statement "that, at a time when many had already come to recognize the greatness of her Son's mission, Mary, at all events, had still failed to understand it." In the life of Mary, Dr. Schmiedel is certain of two points only: first, "that Mary, after the birth of her first-born son, became the mother of other sons and daughters;" secondly, "the only other absolutely authentic scene in Mary's life is that recorded in Mk. iii. 20 f., 31-35," passages in which the critic finds evidence of Mary's disbelief in the claims of her Son, and of her Son's grief over the attitude of His mother.

However briefly the foregoing views may be expressed by Pro-

³⁰ Zur Geschichte der Auslegung der Worte "Wie soll dies geschehen, da ich keinen Mann erkenne?" in *Compte rendu du 4e Congrès scientif. internat. des Cathol.* II., Fribourg, 1898, p. 13-22; *Patrologie*, ed. 2, Freiburg, 1901, p. 128; *Lit. Rundschau*, xxvii., 1901, 7-9.

³¹ *Revue biblique*, ix., 1900, 619 f.

³² *Zeitschr. für katholische Theologie*, iv., 1901, 649-677.

³³ III., 1902, cols. 2952-2969.

fessor Schmiedel, they clearly reveal the writer's view of the great Mother of God, and they thus prepare us for a due appreciation of the contents of the rest of his article. Here the Professor first examines the virgin birth successively in the light of the testimony of Jesus Christ Himself, of Mark, of Luke, of the two genealogies, of Paul, of the Epistle to the Hebrews, of the Fourth Gospel, and of Matthew; next, he professes to state his results, but in reality he shows what is to be done with all the gospel passages which favor the virgin birth;³⁴ finally, the writer states his view as to the origin of the theory of the virgin birth, describes the value of the same, and points out other untenable items in the history of Christ's birth.

A glance at the method of Dr. Schmiedel's proceeding will throw considerable light on the value of his reasoning. It is agreed on all hands that an ambiguous and obscure passage of an author must be interpreted in the light of his clear and definite teaching. The Professor inverts this principle. He first considers a number of biblical passages that are either obscure or irrelevant as far as the mystery of the virgin birth is concerned; after explaining his own meaning into these, he corrects or explains away the passages which clearly and unmistakably contradict his preconceived views of the subject. But the reader has the right as well as the duty to judge for himself.

The critic's appeal to Christ's own testimony is really limited to two gospel texts. In Mt. xii. 28 Jesus declares that He casts out devils by the spirit of God; according to Mk. iii. 33 he asks "who is my mother, and who my brethren?" As evil fate will have it, Professor Schmiedel contributed the article "Gospels" to the second volume of the *Encyclopædia Biblica*; in this³⁵ he admits only nine "absolutely credible passages," and neither of the foregoing two texts is among them. In other words, the critic has cut off the branch on which he now endeavors to rest. But even supposing that the number of the writer's "foundation pillars" be increased from nine to eleven, we still fail to see the connection between Christ's attributing His exorcisms to the spirit of God and His conviction that He has not been begotten by the spirit of God. Again, to infer from Christ's question "who is my mother, and who my brethren" His ignorance of His virgin birth betrays an utter misunderstanding of the words. Twisted into this meaning, they no longer exalt the faithful disciples above those favored by the highest gratuitous privileges, but they tend to lower Christ's unbelieving relatives below His stray followers.

But Mark's testimony may be more to the point. He tells us that

³⁴ Mt. i., 18-25; Lk. i., 34 f.; iii., 23; Mt. i. 16.

³⁵ Vol. II., col. 1881, n. 139 f.

Christ's "kinsmen went out to lay hold of him; for they said, he is beside himself;"³⁶ again, he has kept for us the words of Jesus "a prophet is not without honor save in his own country and among his own kin and in his own house;"³⁷ moreover, he implies that Jesus first received the Holy Ghost at His baptism. Really, it requires more than common intelligence to see the connection between these three data and a denial or, at least, an ignoring of the virgin birth. If Professor Schmiedel could prove that if Jesus had been born of a virgin, He could not have first received the Holy Ghost at His baptism, and He must have been honored in His own country, among His own kin and in His own house, and His kinsmen could not have gone out to lay hold of Him, His appeal to the second evangelist might be valid. It might be valid, if the second evangelist really said or implied what the Professor reads into him. In point of fact, the gospel of Mark does not either say or imply that Jesus *first* received the Holy Ghost at the time of His baptism; He then received a greater plenitude of the gifts of the Holy Ghost. Nor does the second evangelist urge the literal meaning of the proverb quoted by Jesus; no more than the third evangelist leads us to infer that Jesus was considered a physician, though he tells us that the saying "physician, heal thyself" was considered applicable to him. Nor again does Mark tell us that Christ's "kinsmen went out to lay hold of him;" the term rendered "kinsmen" by Dr. Schmiedel reads "friends" both in the Catholic version and the Revised. The Professor has no right to substitute "kinsmen" for "friends," since he does not prove the identity of the latter with those persons of whom Jesus said "who is my mother, and who my brethren?"³⁸

In the next place, the critic asserts quite confidently that the second chapter of St. Luke "knows nothing of the virgin birth" and "rests upon the opposite presupposition;" he adds, moreover, that the two verses in the first chapter of the third gospel which contain the idea "clearly and effectively . . . disturb the connection so manifestly that we are compelled to regard them as a later insertion." We are fully conscious that a statement of the Professor's reasons for his double contention will prove dry and unpleasant. But at the risk of wearying the reader, we shall remain faithful to our method of doing full justice to all the arguments of our opponent.

In order to show that the second chapter of St. Luke implicitly denies the virgin birth, Dr. Schmiedel first appeals to the terms *father, mother*,³⁹ and *parents* of Jesus,⁴⁰ by which the evangelist desig-

³⁶ Mk. iii. 20 f.

³⁷ Mk. vi. 4.

³⁸ Mk. iii. 31 f.

³⁹ Lk. ii. 38, 48.

⁴⁰ Lk. ii. 27, 41, 43.

nates Joseph and Mary. Now, the Professor must be aware that the same terms are used in our days by devout Catholic writers in precisely the same meaning; unless we are to believe that all these modern scholars imply in their language a denial of the virgin birth, we fail to see why this inference should be derived from the language of St. Luke. Nor is the Professor's argument strengthened by the fact that Joseph and Mary marveled at the words of the shepherds and of Simeon,⁴¹ and that they did not understand the words of the boy-Christ.⁴² The knowledge of Mary's virginity did not necessarily turn the hearts of Joseph and Mary into moral icicles or endow their minds with the gift of a supernatural intuition. If our learned opponent knew more of the inner religious life, he would understand that even now many a pious soul, convinced though she be of Mary's perpetual virginity, still wonders at the various mysteries in our Lord's life, and feels quite puzzled over the hidden meaning of the words of our Divine Master.

But Professor Schmiedel adds an apparently more telling argument. The evangelist says⁴³ that "the days of *their* purification were fulfilled;" hence he believes that St. Joseph, too, had contracted the legal uncleanness, and that he was therefore the natural father of the child Jesus. We grant that the more probable reading substitutes "*their* purification" instead of "*her* purification." But if the text does contain any difficulty against the virgin birth, the latter reading is harder for us to answer than the former. Still, the solution is quite clear. It would have been out of the question for Mary to urge the privilege of her unspotted virginity against the injunction of the Mosaic law; if her Divine Son was not believed in spite of all the miracles He worked, how could the mother expect to find faith in her supernatural claims? Mary therefore had to accommodate herself to the practice of the Jewish mothers. And why then find fault with the evangelist for accommodating himself to the language of the same law in a passage in which he relates Mary's observance of the injunction? We stated above that the difficulty of the passage is lessened by the more probable reading "*their* purification," though Professor Schmiedel has failed to observe this. Our learned opponent is well aware that according to the law the Jewish father did not contract any legal uncleanness by the birth of his children; hence he believes that the evangelist's true reading "*their* purification" is "based upon an archæological error." It appears to us that the expression was chosen designedly; the evangelist knew that in the present case the mother had contracted no more uncleanness

⁴¹ Lk. ii. 18 f., 33.

⁴² Lk. ii. 50.

⁴³ Lk. ii. 22.

than the father; at the time he wrote, it was inexpedient to urge Mary's perpetual virginity in clear and open terms, owing to the blasphemous insinuations of the Jews. Hence he declared his own faith in Mary's prerogative implicitly, by placing her purification and therefore her legal uncleanness on the same level with Joseph's purification and uncleanness. In other words, St. Luke declared implicitly that Mary had contracted no legal stain, that she had remained an unspotted virgin.

Our foregoing conclusion is not contradicted by the phrase "with Mary his wife"⁴⁴ which the Professor endeavors to urge against us. This expression is precisely what we naturally expect to find in the passage that has scandalized Dr. Schmiedel. Joseph had married the Virgin Mary after the removal of his doubt related in the first chapter of the first gospel; about the time of Christ's birth therefore the third evangelist rightly calls Mary the wife of Joseph. Our opponent does not appear to realize that the readings "with Mary his spouse" and "with Mary his espoused wife," found in most Codices, create more difficulties to the defender of biblical inerrancy and of the honor of Mary than the reading on which he bases his exception.

Thus far we have considered Professor Schmiedel's attempted proof that the second chapter of the third gospel implicitly denies the virgin birth. Next, we pass on to the Professor's contention that the two passages in the first chapter of St. Luke which "clearly and effectively" relate the virgin birth must be later insertions. First then, according to our critic, the words "How shall this be done, because I know not man" are "on any assumption inappropriate." For the "act of concubitus" cannot be meant by the verb "I know not," seeing that it is in the present tense; in its general sense, the verb "would be quite meaningless in the present context;" finally, the "intermediate meaning" of the verb is excluded, since "the exact opposite is involved in the actual situation." Really, the Professor must find human society a grievous burden. If a friend tells him that he does not drink, the critical faculty of Dr. Schmiedel begins to rebel. "Drink being in the present tense, cannot refer to intoxicating liquor; it cannot have its general meaning, seeing that my friend has not died of thirst; any intermediate meaning is quite excluded by the actual situation. Clearly, my friend did not say I do not drink; my imagination has inserted the phrase." Professor Harnack agrees with Schmiedel in regarding the two verses in the first chapter of St. Luke, now under discussion, as a later insertion, but he candidly acknowledges that the present tense "I know not" points to the assumption of a perpetual virginity.⁴⁵

⁴⁴ Lk. ii. 5.

⁴⁵ Zeitschr. für neut. Wissensch., II., 1901, 55.

Schmiedel's second proof for the later insertion of the verses now under discussion⁴⁶ assumes the following form: In answering Mary's question⁴⁷ the angel repeats, only more clearly, what he had said before the question was asked.⁴⁸ But before Mary asked her question, the angel spoke of "a fulfilment in the way of nature." Hence after Mary's interpolated question the angel only dilates upon the natural birth of an infant. We will not quarrel with the Professor about his first statement; it may be understood in a true and in a false sense. But we emphatically deny the critic's second or minor premise. Even if Mary could be shown to have understood the words as referring to the birth of an infant "in the way of nature," it would not follow that they really bore that meaning, unless we admit the principle that our words always mean what they are understood to mean by those we address. Feeling this weakness in his argument, the Professor begins to modify his former statement by the observation that the angelic words do not *necessarily* refer to a supernatural event. But even in this modified form the statement is not true of the angel's words taken in their context, though in this form the whole force of our opponent's argument is lost. Nor is the Professor more fortunate in his third observation that the notion of a supernatural birth "never at any time attached to the idea of the Jewish Messiah." This statement is quite irrelevant, unless it be supposed that the Old Testament contains a complete description of the person and the offices of the Redeemer, a supposition that is not only gratuitous but positively false. Besides, it is quite untrue that the Old Testament knows nothing of the virgin birth; the first evangelist expressly states that the virgin birth of Christ fulfills the well-known prophecy of Isaias:⁴⁹ "Behold a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and his name shall be called Emmanuel."

But Professor Schmiedel returns again to the fray. The son to be born of Mary, he argues, must be the son of David.⁵⁰ But, according to St. Luke, if we admit the virgin birth, Mary's son cannot be David's son. Hence the virgin birth cannot have been part of the original third gospel. We quite agree with the Professor's first or major premise, but we absolutely deny his second or minor statement. He wishes indeed to be generous, and therefore grants that "we are not in a position to say to what tribe it was that Mary really belonged;" still, he defends the thesis "that the author of Lk. i. held her to be a Levite is certain." And how does the Professor gain

⁴⁶ Lk. i. 34 f.

⁴⁷ Lk. i. 35.

⁴⁸ Lk. i. 30-33.

⁴⁹ vii. 14.

⁵⁰ Lk. i. 32.

this certainty? Why, the author of Lk. i. makes Mary a "kinswoman of Elizabeth,"⁵¹ and represents Elizabeth as "a Levite."⁵² Hence he held Mary to be "a Levite." Now, we confess that it is easy to get confused on genealogical puzzles, and we pardon Dr. Schmiedel beforehand any error into which he may unwittingly fall in this class of questions; but we do not forgive him his cock-sureness. Besides, we really believe that a little consideration on his part would have saved him from his rash conclusion. The evangelist may have known that the mother of Mary and the mother of Elizabeth were sisters. Both may have belonged to the tribe of Levi, though this is immaterial. Furthermore, the evangelist may have been aware that one married into the house of Aaron, and the other into the family of David. Hence he knew their respective daughters, Elizabeth and Mary, to be cousins, and he considered Elizabeth as belonging to the descendants of Aaron, and Mary as being of the family of David. Hence though the author of Lk. i. makes Mary a cousin of Elizabeth, and represents the latter as a Levite, he does not on that account necessarily consider Mary too as belonging to the priestly family.

Professor Schmiedel makes a last effort to prove that the verses in the first chapter of St. Luke's gospel which give evidence for the virgin birth are a later insertion. He believes that Mary's question, "how shall this be done?"⁵³ expresses a doubt as to the veracity of the angel's words; therefore, if it were genuine, Mary ought to have been punished for her doubt, just as Zacharias was punished for questioning the angel's veracity.⁵⁴ Now, apart from the fact that even in the records of Sacred Scripture the same kind of sin is not always represented as being visited by the same kind of punishment, in our present case we have not even the same sin to deal with. Zacharias doubted, and asked for a sign that he might believe; Mary did not doubt, but only expressed her wonder as to the manner in which the angel's words might be verified. Nor does the Professor's depreciation of the angel's argument⁵⁵ strengthen his case; he belittles it, because it concludes from what is less wonderful to what is more wonderful, from Elizabeth's conception in her old age to Mary's virgin birth. As if every argument ought to proceed "a maiore ad minus" in order to be conclusive; the opposite method is recognized as equally legitimate by professional logicians. The parting observation of Dr. Schmiedel that the Greek word *ἐπεὶ* does not occur elsewhere in the third gospel or in Acts is of little

⁵¹ Lk. i. 36.

⁵² Lk. i. 5.

⁵³ Lk. i. 34 f.

⁵⁴ Lk. i. 20.

⁵⁵ Lk. i. 36.

importance. The same word occurs only once in the second gospel,⁵⁶ and still we cannot infer from this fact that the clause it introduces is spurious. Moreover, the composite expression *ἐπεὶ δὲ ἢ ἐπειδὴ* is found elsewhere both in the third gospel and in Acts.⁵⁷

In the next place, Professor Schmiedel considers the testimony of the two genealogies of Christ found respectively in the first and the third gospel.⁵⁸ We do not here intend to inquire whether the view of those commentators is correct who refer one of these genealogies to Mary and the other to Joseph; but we maintain that Schmiedel's main argument for rejecting this view is wrong. For it is based on the contention that according to the third evangelist⁵⁹ Mary belongs to the tribe of Levi, a statement that has not been and cannot be proved from the text of the third gospel. The Professor's next observation is more to the point: Even if only one genealogy refers to Joseph, it shows that Joseph was considered the natural father of Jesus, and therefore excludes the virgin birth. But the argument is more specious than conclusive. Two considerations have already been pointed out which bear to a certain extent on our question. First, the whole body of Catholics refers at least one of the genealogies to St. Joseph, the foster-father of Jesus, without thereby denying the perpetual virginity of our Blessed Lady; can we not suppose, therefore, that the evangelists understood the genealogies in the way in which later Christians interpreted them? Secondly, during the course of the first century there existed good and valid reasons for not divulging the mystery of the virgin birth promiscuously; what wonder, therefore, if the evangelists wrote in such a way as to instruct the initiated Christians without furnishing matter for blasphemy to the enemies of the Church? To these two considerations we may now add a third one: According to an ancient tradition Mary was an heiress and had, therefore, to marry within her own tribe, so that for all those who were acquainted with these particulars the Davidic descent of Joseph implied her own extraction from the tribe of Juda. Since the first and the third gospels exhibit genealogical tables that had originally served in Jewish circles, they naturally presuppose an acquaintance with these data regarded almost as first principles by Hebrew readers. Hence there is no inconsistency on the part of Matthew and Luke, if after giving Joseph's genealogy they deny that Joseph was the natural father of Jesus.⁶⁰

We must confess that we have been tempted more than once to

⁵⁶ Mk. xv. 42.

⁵⁷ Lk. vii. 1; Acts xiii. 46.

⁵⁸ Mt. i. 1-17; Lk. iii. 23-38.

⁵⁹ Lk. i. 36.

⁶⁰ Mt. i. 16; Lk. iii. 23.

break off our analysis of Schmiedel's proofs for his view that the earliest New Testament records know nothing of the virgin birth. They are but a tissue of false premises and illegitimate conclusions. But seeing that only a few more witnesses remain to be heard, we shall for the sake of completeness continue our wearisome task even to the end. Professor Schmiedel's next point of evidence is taken from the writings of St. Paul. He believes the apostle's statement⁶¹ "that Jesus was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, is irreconcilable with his virgin birth." He does not understand why reference has not been made "to the share which the Holy Ghost . . . had in his generation." In a similar way, the Professor might infer from the next verse that God the Father did not beget His Son from all eternity. Or does not the apostle say that Jesus Christ "was predestinated the Son of God . . . by the resurrection . . . from the dead?" The share which God the Father had in the eternal generation is not mentioned. Thus far we have added only a new puzzle to Schmiedel's exception; but we can go a step further, and produce light out of twofold darkness. The Greek term rendered in our version "was predestinated" really means "was declared." The apostle, therefore, tells us that Jesus Christ was declared, or shown, to be the Son of God, or true God, by His resurrection from the dead; and similarly He was made known to be true man by His descent from David. The mention of the Father as the principle of the divine generation, and of the Holy Ghost as the sharer in the human generation of Jesus Christ would have rendered the passage of St. Paul too obscure.

But the critic has not yet done with St. Paul; does he not say⁶² that God sends forth His Son "in the likeness of sinful flesh?" And "since the apostle in Rom. v. 12 traces the sinfulness of mankind to its descent from Adam, such a statement would certainly be impossible, the virgin birth being held." Perhaps we might be able to answer the foregoing difficulty by determining the limits of God's power, by inquiring whether a human being conceived by the Holy Ghost can be born in original sin. But happily our present case does not require such deep investigations. For, in the first place, the Professor changes his middle term: in the major premise it is "the likeness of sinful flesh," in the minor premise it becomes "sinfulness of mankind." Secondly, the Professor misinterprets the Greek phrase *ἐν σαρτί*; instead of representing Jesus as robed in flesh, which *looked like* sinful flesh, "in the appearance of sinful flesh," he implies that Jesus had really contracted the sinfulness of human flesh.

⁶¹ Rom. i. 3.

⁶² Rom. viii. 3.

"The most important passage, however," Dr. Schmiedel tells us in the next place, "is found in Gal. iv. 4." The entire verse reads: "But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent his Son, made of a woman, made under the law." Now, the critic does not wish to build his argument on the phrase "made of a woman; for after all, a virgin is also a woman." But he appeals to the context "born under the law, that he might redeem them which were under the law;" hence, he argues, it is shown "that in order to become their redeemer it behooved Jesus to be completely like those He came to redeem." The simple rules of Dialectics show here that the Professor's conclusion is wider than his premises. At best it follows, and even this does not follow, "that in order to become their redeemer it behooved Jesus to be completely" under the law "like those He came to redeem." But from this hypothetic conclusion it is quite impossible to infer the further conclusion "thus also the phrase 'born of a woman' denotes a birth differing in no essential particular from ordinary human births." It is quite impossible to arrive at this further conclusion from the foregoing data, first, because the middle term of the new argument "to be completely under the law" does not necessarily imply "a birth differing in no particular from ordinary human births;" secondly, because this latter expression is in its turn quite different from the phrase "born of a woman," so that the most favorable inference the Professor might have drawn from his premises, if he had manipulated them properly, would read "thus also the phrase 'born of a woman' denotes a birth differing in no essential particular" from the giving birth of women. But on the one hand, this last conclusion is verified in our Lord's birth, and on the other, it does not exclude the virgin birth. Apart from all artificial inferences, St. Paul's expression "born of a woman" may not be sufficient to establish the mystery of the virgin birth, but it admirably agrees with this mystery, if we suppose that the apostle believed in it.

Professor Schmiedel's last observation concerning St. Paul's view on the virgin birth appears to have been regarded as of inferior value by the writer himself; for it is added to the preceding remarks in smaller type. It may be formulated in this way: Paul is "the first to formulate . . . the doctrine of the pre-existence of Jesus. . . . If, however, the doctrine of the virgin birth had been handed down to him, he would hardly have framed a doctrine of the pre-existent state." We need not expressly add the conclusion of this argument, since with all due respect to Professor Schmiedel we feel bound to deny both his premises. The writer himself has his doubts as to the truth of the major premise; hence he adds rather naively "unless indeed one were to regard the utterances of the Johannine Christ

regarding his pre-existence as historical." As to the minor premise, too, the Professor has his misgivings; hence he wishes his readers to believe that the doctrine of the pre-existent state is "hard to reconcile with such a tradition (of the virgin birth) received from the original apostles." Needless to say that we admit the utterances of the Johannine Christ as historical, and that we do not see any special difficulty in reconciling the pre-existence of the person of Christ with His *virgin* birth; the difficulty touches rather His *human* birth, and His birth in time.

The Epistle to the Hebrews has proved rather barren in exceptions to the virgin birth. Professor Schmiedel only argues that according to Hebr. vii. 14 "our Lord sprang out of Judah;" hence "for all who find themselves compelled to believe that Luke rightly attributes a Levitical descent to Mary, Hebr. vii. 14 testifies unquestionably and with emphasis against the doctrine of the virgin birth." Now, we are in the happy position of not finding ourselves compelled to believe that *Luke is right* in making Mary "a Levite;" for we have already shown that Luke does not make Mary a Levite at all.

The Fourth Gospel affords again a wider field of exploitation, though the Professor himself confesses that, owing to the fourth evangelist's clear doctrine concerning the eternal existence of the Logos, the mystery of the virgin birth must have been of less importance in his eyes. Still, he believes that it would have been important for Jesus Christ to be able to say that He had been "born in an altogether exceptional way." Here the Professor does not appear to notice his anachronism; he speaks as if the future record of John might have rendered it possible or impossible for Jesus to appeal to His virgin birth. But apart from this oversight, the Professor does not seem to realize that Christ's virgin birth was hardly a sign which He could appeal to; it was rather a mystery that had to be believed on Christ's authority, and had to be confirmed by miracles. Hence we cannot be astonished that Philip⁶³ in his early intercourse with the Master, and the Jews⁶⁴ call Jesus the son of Joseph. The additional remark of the Professor that Nazareth is spoken of as Jesus' birthplace⁶⁵ does not influence the fact of the virgin birth.

It is rather amusing to read in the critic's next paragraph: "No direct polemic, however, against the virgin birth of Jesus can be discovered in Jn. i. 13." We need not repeat the Professor's argument by which he proves the foregoing statement; but we must

⁶³ Jn. i. 45.

⁶⁴ Jn. vi. 42.

⁶⁵ Jn. i. 45; vii. 41 f., 52.

direct attention to his smooth method of avoiding the argument in favor of Christ's virgin birth which can be based on the passage⁶⁶ in which he adroitly discovers no polemic against the virgin birth. According to Resch,⁶⁷ the Johannine passage now under consideration most explicitly denies that Jesus was conceived by the intervention of a human father.

Still, Professor Schmiedel is not as yet satisfied with himself nor with the Fourth Gospel. "Nevertheless," he says, "it is not impossible that the Fourth Gospel contains a tacit rejection of the doctrine in question." Surely, a most ingenious way out of difficulties. And here is the ground on which the writer's supposition is based. "If only we may suppose that he (the Fourth Evangelist) knew it (the current doctrine of the virgin birth) it would be quite in accordance with the spirit of its (the Fourth Gospel's) author if the doctrine appeared to him too slight and too external for the Logos." On our part, we feel fully convinced that the evangelist knew the mystery of the virgin birth, though our conviction is not the result of the Professor's proof; but we are equally convinced that the virgin disciple did not regard Mary's virginity in the light suggested by Professor Schmiedel. If the Fourth Gospel tacitly rejects anything that touches the question of the virgin birth, it surely is the Professor's view of the case.

Finally Dr. Schmiedel invites us to consider "it antecedently probable that from Matthew as well as from Luke the theory of the virgin birth of Jesus was originally absent." His proofs are of the same kind as those we have thus far considered. It is therefore antecedently probable that they are not conclusive. First, he brings up the words "Is not this the carpenter's son?"⁶⁸ spoken by the unbelieving citizens of Christ's own country, though the evangelist does not endorse this saying. But we can hardly believe that the Professor is really serious in this part of his argumentation. He cannot be fully in earnest, when he argues that the second chapter of the first gospel "admits of a complete understanding without the presupposition of the virgin birth," and that the account of the virginal conception of the child in the first chapter⁶⁹ "thus appears not only to be later than chap. 2, but also to have been somewhat heedlessly introduced." Here we have certainly a new method of arguing which proves anything and therefore nothing. The third chapter can be fully understood without the second chapter; therefore the second chapter is later than the third. Clearly, even higher criti-

⁶⁶ Jn. i. 13.

⁶⁷ *Das Kindheitsevangelium*, Leipzig, 1897, p. 249 f.

⁶⁸ Mt. xiii. 55.

⁶⁹ Mt. i. 18-25.

cism must retain some appearance of reasonableness, if it does not wish to lose all credit.

Thus far we have followed Professor Schmiedel in his study of the various New Testament sources which bear more or less *indirectly* on the virgin birth. We shall now briefly state the Professor's opinion on the four passages which testify *clearly* and *directly* in favor of our Blessed Lady's virginity. They are: 1. St. Matthew's account of Joseph's doubt concerning our Blessed Lady, of the removal of this doubt by the intervention of an angel, and of the formal marriage of Joseph and Mary;⁷⁰ 2. St. Luke's relation of Mary's question "How shall this be done?" and of the angel's answer;⁷¹ 3. The last verse in St. Matthew's genealogy of Jesus: "And Jacob begot Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ;"⁷² 4. The phrase "as it was supposed" found in the beginning of St. Luke's genealogy of Jesus. After the preceding investigation, Dr. Schmiedel considers himself "in a position to sum up and complete the results arrived at." His sweeping verdict is that all of these four passages are later insertions. There is only this difference between them, that the first two were inserted on their own account, while the last two were inserted to harmonize the existing genealogies of the first and third gospels with the first two interpolations.

No honest textual critic has ever doubted about the genuineness of the first two passages, or of the phrase "as it was supposed" in the third gospel. All editions of the sacred text from the Erasmusian down to those issued by Tischendorf, Nestle, Westcott and Hort, B. Weiss, Brandscheid, and other modern scholars of standing, retain the foregoing texts without the slightest indication of doubt as to their genuineness. It is not, therefore, external authority that induces Professor Schmiedel to adopt his radical method of destruction. The state of the case is as follows: Professor Schmiedel's prejudice has prompted him to explain into a number of texts what they do not contain, and to explain away the real meaning of another series of texts; after this he is brought face to face with texts which are too clear to be explained away or to be twisted so as to agree with his preconceived ideas. So much the worse for the texts: Professor Schmiedel is right, as a matter of course, and the gospels are wrong.

One of the four passages, which we enumerated as bearing directly on the virgin birth, happens to exhibit a variety of readings in different sources. It is here that Professor Schmiedel's ingenuity

⁷⁰ Mt. i. 18-25.

⁷¹ Lk. i. 34 f.

⁷² Mt. i. 16.

reaches the height of absurdity. In the "*Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila*," edited by Conybeare,⁷⁸ we find the reading: "Jacob begot Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus who is called Christ, and Joseph begot Jesus who is called Christ." Now in the first place, Conybeare's edition rests on the authority of only one Codex of the twelfth century; for a textual critic it is simply out of the question to compare a twelfth century reading with a reading of the fourth or fifth century, and much less can he prefer the former to the latter. In the second place, a textual critic must take the reading as his Codex gives it, or else not appeal to his Codex at all. But, however plain and elementary these principles may appear to be, they are simply ignored by Professor Schmiedel. He first bravely tells us that the "original text" of Mt. i. 16 "was first actually discovered in the '*Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila*.'" In the same breath he adds that the original text reads "and Joseph begot Jesus," the words "the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus who is called Christ" being omitted. In other words, the critic professes to regard a twelfth century reading preferable to the text of the great fourth and fifth century Codices; but in spite of his plain words, he substitutes a reading of his own make instead of the promised twelfth century text.

We shall not weary the reader with the Professor's imaginary process of evolution that has resulted in our present text of Mt. i. 16. All through, the principles of textual criticism are simply set aside; there is no authority except the wish of Professor Schmiedel, and he is infallible. While he hardly produces a single argument that really concludes, some of his reasonings are positively comical when they are divested of their learned varnish. "As soon as we have satisfied ourselves," the Professor writes, "how neither Jesus, nor his mother, nor Mark, nor the author of Mt. iii.-xxviii. or of Lk. iii.-xxiv., nor yet the authors of Lk. ii. or of i. 5-33, 36-80 or of Mt. i. 1-19 or of chapt. ii. were acquainted with the virgin birth, it were indeed too absurd an anachronism to attribute to falsification by a sect the fact that in Mt. i. 16 Joseph figures as the father of Jesus." In other words: The virgin birth is not mentioned in the gospels except where it is mentioned. Therefore the singular and rare reading which makes Joseph the father of Jesus cannot be due to a falsification by heretics. Truly, a very convenient form of argument. The divinity of Christ is not mentioned in the gospels except in the passages in which it is mentioned; therefore Christ is not God according to Sacred Scripture. Again, Professor Schmiedel has not contributed anything to the *Encyclopædia Biblica* except what he has contributed. Therefore he has contributed nothing at all.

⁷⁸ *Anecd. Oxon. Class.* ser. 8, 1898, p. 76.

The reader has no doubt felt convinced before this that in his treatment of Mary's virginity Professor Schmiedel cares little for common sense and solid reason and truth; but he does care a great deal for novelty and the infallibility of Professor Schmiedel. It is needless to say that reason and truth are preferable to novelty and Schmiedel.

A. J. MAAS, S. J.

Woodstock, Md.

REFORM AND REFORMERS.

SOCIAL Reform has become such an important feature of modern life that it is regarded as the most vital problem that confronts society to-day. It has created a strong and dignified literature which effectively teaches this, and it has created a class of Reformers, which certainly merits a hearing. Scholarship, Literature, Politics have contributed able men to the cause, and they have added greatly to its force, though in fact these are outnumbered, outvoiced and outwritten by the less creditable believers who add only enthusiasm and numbers to the movement.

In spite of the strength, dignity and essential rightness in Reform, it meets serious, even stern opposition. It is looked upon as a menace, its gospel repudiated as a dream and its apostles ostracized as enemies of public order. There is as much reality, earnestness and zeal with reform, as against it; surely as much historical vindication of it as of condemnation for it. Looking closely at the situation one finds that the usual happens; that as in the case with most contentions touching human interests, right and wrong, understanding and misunderstanding, merited and unmerited criticism abound on both sides. The objective situation as a fact is confused with the subjective estimate of facts, partial views parade as complete ones and personality and principle are often confused. The partisan is not fair; the non-partisan has no standing. One must be Reformer or Conservative and adopt the language, spirit and methods of his party, or be ruled out.

Interesting as is every phase of the great question, the subjective view of the Reformer seems to be particularly so. Once we know him sympathetically, we understand how much he represents, and how natural is the process which produces him. Such a study is here attempted. After a brief glance at the psychological conditions out of which Conservatism and Reform appear in society, as

general antagonistic tendencies, the Reform spirit, the Reformer and the Reform Party are described on the subjective side. Such a view is necessarily incomplete, but it may possibly not be without its uses.

The phrase Social Reform is employed in so many senses that it is difficult for one to fix a meaning to which one can remain faithful even in one's thinking. Any given social group aiming at a fixed purpose, usually devises ways and means called institutions by which the purpose is worked out. In the event that results show complete or partial failure in the institutions or methods, if the group possess any ambition, it will strive to correct the faults which hinder success. This effort will be called reform effort. In this sense, we speak of educational reform, tariff reform; the reform of the constitution of an art club, of a secret society or of a labor union. Hence reform effort is a general social phenomenon. Two currents of activity will be noticed; the normal movement in achieving results and the reforming effort, as secondary, and accidental.

The unification of human society, solidarity among its members, the development of contact, communication, language, trade and law, have gradually led us into the habit of thinking of society itself as one vast group, nation by nation, possessing unity of purpose, of institutions and methods for its realization. We think, therefore, of social progress as one—social questions or evils as one—social reform as one; merely enlarging into a complex field, the simple view just referred to. Modern society rests practically on an economic basis; industrial society is the determining element to-day. One's religion, culture, education, even one's ethical and esthetic development are largely determined by one's possession of or control of wealth. Our political ambition, social standards, virtues and vices are likewise largely affected by it. Our economic life is individualistic; the majority of our people, wage earners. The wages question is therefore the primary social question. It is customary for many if not all reformers to group all questions of intemperance, immorality, ignorance, private and public dishonesty around the economic phase of life. Thus Social Reform, while in itself a general sociological phenomenon, has primarily to do with economic reform, and through it, with all life and its problems. Sanz Y. Escartin in *L'Individu et la Reforme Sociale* (French ed. by Dietrich, page 21) says that social reform consists in the equitable distribution of the goods of this world, not only of riches but also and above all, in morality, health, knowledge, the enjoyment of art and nature, in family and dignity. And Hobson in his sketch of Ruskin as a Reformer (p. 29) uses the term in its broad sense "to describe those larger changes in the structure or working of society which aim

directly at some general improvement of human life, as distinguished from such work of reform as attacks narrower and more specific defects." As the term tends to establish itself in the mind of the typical, general reformer, it assumes a fairly definite meaning. His aim is universal peace, culture, justice, happiness. Present institutions are impotent to secure it; he desires a readjustment of society, which promises the realization of his cherished hope. The degree to which reformers surrender to this hope and the methods to which they resort in attempts to realize it, differentiate them fairly well among themselves, and distinguish them too, broadly from those whom we do not call reformers.

All men are to an extent reformers; they unite in their remote ideals and in admitting the limitations of life, the need of constant readjustment of situations and institutions. The most determined conservative will not resent all efforts at reform. He merely has his peculiar views of what is needed, of what is possible and advisable. One class is inclined to be slow in change, slow in seeing reasons for it, cautious in making it. Such men assert belief in the power of the individual to rise when he wills. We have in this class a uniform spirit, similar conditions among members, and every degree of faith in the goodness of things as they are. Here we find Conservatism. Another class is quick to see reasons for change, reckless in making it, inclined to emphasize the reasons for it. Such men assert that the individual cannot rise when he wills, unless institutions be improved. We have then every variety of temperament, discretion, aim and method from extreme radical to mild conservative. Here we find Radicalism, or Reform. Possibly, in the course of the study, this thought will emerge more clearly.

Reform effort is a permanent phenomenon in human history. There is no time, no nation without it nor is progress in any form of social life free from obligations to it. To-day there is scarcely an institution which does not in some way manifest such effort. The press and literature are filled with information about social and political reform, dress and ballot reform, educational and tax reform, asylum and church reform, charity and tariff reform, judicial and medical reform. Commissions are created to investigate and report, experiments are everywhere proposed or made; some attack and some defend innovation; there is no escape, for as Emerson once said, the demon of reform is everywhere. Brice in an interesting study on "An Age of Discontent," in the *Contemporary Review* (vol. 59) attempts to show that the unrest which we notice is quite peculiar to our time. But it is probably not distinctive except in accidental features. Need of reform, effort for it and opposition to it are practically constant in history.

Men are finite in purpose, in capacity and achievement. They are never as good as the goodness that they know, they are nearly always inclined to be contented with conditions which in some way fall short of what they might wish. The institutions which individuals create reveal the same truth. Society is never as good as the goodness which it knows, never as perfect as the perfection that it sees; it easily tolerates conditions which are far below its philosophy and ideals. The margin between what society knows and what it is, makes reform effort possible, even inevitable. A society absolutely contented with itself could manifest no reform movement; one which is as good and perfect as its advanced knowledge, needs no reform; one with no knowledge of anything better than it is, desires none. Knowledge of the better stirs to discontent. Our discontent to-day, with charity work, methods of taxation, industrial methods, educational work and the like, is due to the appreciation of defects and to the knowledge of more perfect methods which we wish to see adopted.

When one attempts to isolate the phenomenon of reform, one is inclined to think that the world never before saw such a feverish desire for it as we now behold. We doubt the value of religious liberty, of political liberty, of industrial liberty; we think of times when limited liberty seemed to insure more nobility, less education meant more comfort, fewer rights meant more justice and narrow life gave greater peace. And so, contact, communication of thought, travel and the press, social solidarity have distributed the spirit of discontent to the point where any individual may share the discontent of everyone—and reform may become paramount to him. An advance made anywhere in society, affects society as a whole; progress in psychology affects education, theology, medicine and philosophy. Thought is constantly advancing. The better that we know is constantly growing better while the institutions which control our living, move slowly when they do not fail. Thought rarely falls below its highest level; institutions do always; thus the prospect of reform is permanent. It will generally spring from similar situations, no matter in what department of social life. There will be reform and anti-reform; some tenacious of what is, others eager for what might be; the favorites of a situation against its victims; the old against the new, the acknowledged imperfect against the alleged perfect. The history of industry, of law, of education, of finance, furnishes abundant illustration.

If reform is a permanent phenomenon in the history of social institutions, it takes a place very near to progress, and it merits a reputation which it, in fact, does not enjoy. In the nature of the case, it will be, as a rule, of lowly origin; cranks and freaks may and do

attach themselves to it; men of limited attainments and pronounced egotism, of questioned sanity and intemperate speech, who dream and scold and wear ill-fitting clothes, yet, even they perform a service to the cause, as was wisely remarked by Brice in the article referred to. "It is one of the merits of democracy that it produces the crank and deals leniently with him. He is one of the voices of dissent and dissatisfaction, not useless even when he preaches some old fallacy, for he obliges us to refute him but eminently useful when he has got hold of a fragment of a forgotten or only half discovered truth." Unfortunately, public opinion seems to be ignorant of this; it misjudges reform by estimating its worst representatives alone, and condemns it before hearing a defense.

It might be well if we had a better knowledge of its constitution, its psychological elements and its deeper relation to the whole process of life. Whether or not we give it sympathy, we should at least give it justice. As social reform is the most prominent phase of reform in the public mind to-day, attention is directed largely to it in this study.

The thinking of to-day is a wonderful phenomenon. Its utter abandon, irresponsibility and seeming lack of purpose; facility of publication and of sale of books and papers, have given it a momentum that is remarkable. Good thinking and poor thinking abound, though the demand is as much for freedom of research as for truth. As regards social thinking, there is not much question about how much of the new thought our institutions can absorb; little concern about possible dangers to our social structure in theories carelessly advanced. The watchword is—think, speculate, publish, sell. "The genius of the day does not incline to a deed, but to a beholding." Emerson's remark is as true now as when he wrote it. We have bales and bales of thought tied neatly by the strings of logic, and counted as part of our social wealth, useless largely, because our institutions cannot be adjusted to it. We are behind the thinking of the French Revolution in our own institutions, to-day. This eagerness to think and failure to think to a purpose have misled us into caring too much for correctness of thought and too little for correctness of life. We have numberless books telling us about human rights, liberty, fraternity and happiness, all models of logic, written possibly long after suffering men and women and children had proclaimed these truths on the pages of life. The facts of crime, arrested development, blameless misery and needless suffering, seem to concern us less than definition and argument. We have no statistics to show the numbers of laborers to whom the right of union is denied in fact while we have many books and laws showing that they may exercise it; no tables showing the numbers

who do enjoy and the numbers who do not enjoy, reasonable opportunity of culture, happiness and home, while we have abundant volumes showing that men and women have the right to such enjoyment. Were we wiser, did we aim to work into realization, a fraction of the rights about which we write and teach, history would be far less sad and life would bring more joy. We go to a tailor not for cloth but for clothes; to a shoemaker not for leather but for shoes; in either case, the material is cut to fit, and made to meet a need. Men require, not abstract liberty so much as moderate liberty, cut to fit. The amazing incongruity to which this condition has led us is seen in the fact that the nation tells us whether or not a soldier returning from the Philippine Islands may bring with him rings free of duty, while it stands paralyzed for five months, helpless in the coal strike which was a national calamity. Whether or not human progress requires this great activity of thought is of course not in question; the fact is stated as one which may aid us to understand reform activity.

This high plane of social thinking has given us very high social ideals. Everyone is to-day more or less educated, more or less susceptible to the charm of the ideal. Many have been fascinated by it; they believe in it, believe that perfection is possible; they accept liberty, equality, fraternity as axioms, self-evident. They study the mocking failures of institutions, demand improvement—the uplifting of institutions to the plane of the ideal. Knowledge of the better stirs to discontent and Reform is born. Ranging from the extreme of anarchy down through its various forms to socialism; through its forms down to the labor movement, and down through its various phases, we have every degree of discontent and idealism. The anarchist is totally an idealist; the labor leader, moderately so; the former misses the limitations of the real, the latter reckons them to some extent. Summed up, however, the movement in all phases results from the advance of thought, over the achievements of our institutions.

All institutions seem to an extent, to fail. Were any institution to meet its purpose perfectly, at a given time, failure would soon appear, through the shifting of life. The psychological inertia of institutions as well as their rigidity hinders them from changing quickly enough to anticipate problems. While institutions rarely accomplish all that is aimed at, they nevertheless accomplish much. It is not too much to say that they are identical with civilization. Many are impressed deeply by what our institutions have achieved, and but little by what they have failed to do. They see the splendid picture of widening appreciation of human dignity and rights as it appears in history, of the triumphs over ignorance and barbarism

which constitute the glory of the race. The many who take a view like this, therefore, are champions of what is. They compare it with what has been, and declare themselves content. Order and peace, security of life and property, education, progress, individual development, all such features of society give them inspiration. They are satisfied with the real; the ideal does not appeal to them so strongly. When institutions are not questioned or conditions not attacked, their apologists and friends remain quiet and unconcerned. But when Reform appears, challenges everything or anything, and advocates ideals, the friends of institutions assert themselves and make defense. Then Conservatism is born. Nature thus brings face to face, conservative and reformer as types of social processes, both necessary and each an obstacle, both narrow, intolerant, impatient. Out of the conflict of the two tendencies comes much of the elevation of the race, which we call progress.

The composition of the conservative class may be outlined easily. The favored of fortune, who in the present individualistic condition, possess wealth, power or position; they who are strong and self-reliant, who have "the sense of established facts," who by nature are cautious, matter of fact or optimistic. Our present day civilization rests on the institution of property and the principles of individualism. Conservatism is their defender, while Reform is always aggressive. The lazy, careless, ignorant, in society; men who are utterly devoid of ambition or aspiration give some strength to conservatism. It has the influence of establishment, of press, literature, religion, government; and is admirably equipped in every way for self defense.

The spirit of conservatism is traditional; it insists on the limitations of man and forgets his possibilities. It sees social processes clearly and is cautious to the point of inaction. It is diplomatic, ready to compromise when an opponent obstructs its path, because it is less devoted to principle than to fact. It is prepared to be honest as far as honesty pays, but it is not incapable of dishonesty to win its purpose. By the nature of the case, it is well educated, correct in conduct, well dressed, cultured. Its mistakes of inaction are not easily calculated, hence it is not introspective; self critical. Its principle is "Let well enough alone." Finding things fairly good, it resists any attempt to better them. "Le bien, c'est l'ennemi du mieux." The solid and essential honesty of conservatism's main motive cannot be questioned, but its claim to entire honesty may well be doubted. It includes, in its circle, every variety of motive and personality from the "somnolent respectability" of one to the generous sincere consecration of another to the welfare of society. It has worthy and unworthy representatives, good and bad methods,

wise and unwise policies, virtues and vices. It is not necessarily opposed to all change but is predisposed against much of it. There is in it a tendency to selfishness because it begins by devotion to institutions, gradually shifts to devotion to self, becomes selfish psychologically and aims to maintain itself against opposition, independently of the rightness of its claims.

Conservatism is consequently all powerful, the inertia of institutions favors it; ignorance and indifference in the masses strengthen it; self interest, fear of change add to its power; the greatest in government, highest in religion, and most cultured in education are apt to be at its service. Thus constituted, it is the protection of civilization, the security of progress, though too, at times a hindrance and a check to both. Its inherent tendency is to stagnation, inaction, but as a rule not allowed to remain unopposed. Whenever it endangers progress, reform appears; irrespressible, eloquent, appealing, it forces movement and protects society. This is true of society at large, true also of every social group, stable enough to give rise to the two tendencies. Conservatism and Reform in education, in government, in taxation, science, religion, everywhere are the product of the same law, are essentially alike, perform practically the same function, and reveal the same wonderful process of advance without danger, and caution without delay, which the course of history reveals.

Conservatism is the philosophy of those who are content with given conditions; Reform, the philosophy of those who accept advanced thought and aim to force the situation to adjustment. Conservatism recoils from the "exorbitant idea," reform recoils from the "dwarfish actual." An orator at the Buffalo Reform convention July, 1899, used this picturesque figure to express the relation of the two: "Every foot of land, every pound of product, every hearthstone, every purse is found insulated with conservatism and timidity when touched by the current of radicalism."

Reform is protest and aspiration. Attached to the ideal, it is discontented with the real; and it even fails to see or seeing, to admit the good that the actual possesses. "Le mieux, c'est l'ennemi du bien." We may then venture to name those who are apt to become reformers. Many will come from among those who study and love the ideal, who write and think about typical perfection; whose sense of the beautiful is professedly cultivated; hence, many poets, artists, and men of letters. Ruskin was made a reformer of the intense type, by recognizing the relation of art and national character, and Morris is the greatest modern teacher of the reform ideal. To all such the ugly mechanical features of life are repulsive; they detest a locomotive and like clouds; loathe business and love

dreams. The imperfections of life and institutions are intolerable to many in this class; so much so that, while but few come to be called reformers, many of them write, teach and defend reform sentiments of the most pronounced type. Carlyle, Ruskin, Morris, were professed reformers. Byron, Wordsworth and Whittier were so in fact if not in name. Many reformers will necessarily come from among the victims of a situation. Men who know of a culture that is denied them, who aspire to an equality which society promises in theory and denies in fact. When such classes—so numerous and important—are roused, reform sentiment thrives. They seek a better which they know and resent the limitations which they feel. The labor movement, Socialism, Anarchy, furnish illustration here. Many men of sympathetic nature and tender consciences, who see so much human misery in life and so much dishonesty in business; so much affirmation in theory and negation in practice, easily reach a condition of indignant protest which leads them into the reform army. An immense amount of reform sentiment is found among others who do not know what to do; clergymen, professional men, teachers, business men. Conviction is clear in them, but they see no way of reform that promises less evil than what they witness now.

One finds that many, in fact most reformers have a personal history which best explains their course. The more one thus studies the individual psychological aspects of reform, the more clearly one sees that men do not elect to be reformers by a bare act of reason. Temperament and circumstances explain much. The readiness of a Reformer to sacrifice everything and to suffer for the "cause" cannot be explained by argument. The practical bearing of this truth is that argument and statistics rarely make reformers and more rarely convert them from reform. Ruskin's classification of painters in "Stones of Venice" (vol. ii., p. 187) might well be applied to this thought. "Everything presented to them in nature has good and evil mingled in it; and artists considered as searchers after truth are again to be divided into three great classes: a right, a left and a center. Those on the right perceive and pursue the good and leave the evil; those on the center, the greatest, perceive and pursue the good and evil together; the whole thing as it verily is; those on the left perceive and pursue the evil and leave the good." The deeper tendency of Reform is to see the evil and miss the good, while that of conservatism is the inverse.

The spirit of Reform is strange, subtle, fascinating. It springs from a sense of wrong—outrage is a favorite word—and hence in its propaganda insists mainly on rights. It lacks, consequently, to some degree the sense of responsibility and the reserve which that

sense originally engenders. It is marked by extravagance of statement, little sense for detail or appreciation of slow complex social processes. It confuses the mental, moral, social and psychological elements in reform, and seems to miss the whole historical process of life. It is keenly sensitive to the ideal, hence marked by deep feeling and the power that feeling gives. It inclines often to abusive terms, and is essentially uncompromising. It deals with principles and large truths, comprehensive views, not with fragments and details, hence it cannot compromise. A Reformer said at the Buffalo convention in June, 1899: "The Reformer bows to nothing but genius and kneels to nothing but goodness;" and Wendell Phillips once said that reformers deal only with ideas, conscience and common sense. It is primarily unselfish even to the point of martyrdom; the reformer serving class or humanity and being distinctly conscious of a mission in the world. It is essentially aggressive, eager, possibly, as John Randolph said of it, "meddling, obtrusive, intrusive, restless, dissatisfied." It is so intent, concentrated on its work, that it has no inclination to study, admit or admire progress already made. It may not always deny—it is disinclined to see. It is supported by protest, justified by failure and hence its apology is in the limitations and not in the success of institutions.

We see in the spirit of reform a two-fold tendency to expand; it tends to become more intense in that it becomes more radical and it seeks to be all comprehensive. John Stuart Mill made it the object of his life to become a reformer of the world; one who has any acquaintance with reformers is familiar with the projects by which universal peace, joy and comfort are to be secured by a simple reform. A writer in the *Fortnightly* (Vol. lxx., p. 741) seeking to protect a reformer who had accomplished much good in New York from the imputation of being an extremist, said of him that he was one "who knew what could and could not be done; who was never content with less than the possible best, but who never threw away that possible best because it was not the ideal best; who did not try to reform the universe, but merely his own district." Then, too, reform tends to become more radical; its trend is not backward toward conservatism; it is forward. Hawthorne expressed this truth well in "Earth's Holocaust." The reformers first burned papers and periodicals; next decorations of nobility; then an impulse came to burn the nobles; next robes of royalty and crowns; then liquor and tobacco. The fever spread and people threw away possessions; weapons of war were next demolished; then instruments of torture and death; marriage certificates, money, books and literature. Then advance was made on ecclesiastical vestments and symbols—finally the bible.

The impulses of Reform are often noble, its aims high and ethical, yet it leans to abuse, hatred, impatience of personality; to means of questionable nature. It seems to think that reform is a matter merely of volition. To order or decree a reform, to make an appeal to the popular sense of justice, truth and harmony is sufficient. It constantly makes such appeal, fails as frequently and seems to learn nothing by experience. A band of reformers founded the Christian Political Union in Chicago in January, 1900. They were not numerous, but they were typical. The following announcement was made:

"We believe the fullness of time to have arrived when the eternal principles of justice, mercy and love, as exemplified in the life and teachings of Jesus Christ, should be embodied in the political economy of our nation and applied in concrete form to every function of our government, national, State, municipal and local. We believe that the most direct means of accomplishing this end is the formation of a political body of united Christian men and women, who shall use their elective franchise for the selection of able, worthy and conscientious public officials who will seek in their respective positions to perform the functions of government in the spirit of the man of Galilee.

"We declare that this movement is in no sense ecclesiastical or dogmatic in its purpose, and contemplates no challenge of any person's faith or creed; aims not to disturb church relationships nor to unite Church and State in politico-ecclesiastical bonds, but seeks solely to unify the forces of righteousness in the name and spirit of Jesus for political, social and commercial reform."

The platform of the Populist Party in 1892 contained an equal amount of serene optimism, idealism and ignorance of the processes and limitations of life. "The forces of reform this day organized will never cease to move forward until every wrong is righted and equal rights and privileges established for all the men and women of the country." The party *decreed* "That the union of the labor forces of the United States this day consummated shall be permanent and perpetual."

Reform is, in its deeper nature, chained to the ideal. It goes on the assumption that people love and seek social truth and justice, development and culture. The assumption is false. Our popular philosopher has said that right is less loved in the world than is comfort; that "a healthy man will never reform while he has the strength." The masses are indifferent to reform, and they rarely support reform administrations. The Louisville Courier-Journal said (April 5, 1902) apropos of the New York Reform administration: "It was dangerous to promise unalloyed righteousness for

fear that the voters would not endorse the program." Thus is illustrated the wise remark of Mackenzie, who says in his "Social Philosophy" that whole truths are seldom so good to fight with as half truths. The conservative usually takes the half truth, the reformer, the whole one.

The Reform spirit draws reformers together, leads them to attempt party formation, though they generally fail to make a permanent party, unless practical measures—not specific to reform—be taken as a basis of union. A prohibition platform ranges over the whole field of political life. The Equal Rights party in 1884 contained thirteen planks that had no connection with Equal Rights. Consequently, reform is apt to have no long standing traditions, to lack in reverence for the past and in the caution, sense of reality and proportion which a past creates.

The task of Reform is never ending. When it has removed obstacles it must construct; when one task is done, another appears. When it has shown that a reform is necessary, as a rule it has not the position, leadership or wisdom to carry it through. An admitted reform becomes property of conservatism immediately. This latter adopts, fosters, enacts any measure which it cannot escape. Thus Reform is robbed of its victory. Twenty-five years ago a certain principle was secretly taught in labor circles. In 1902 it was incorporated *ipsisimis verbis* in the platform of one of our great parties as a self-evident proposition. It is now a conservative measure. Meantime Reform has moved on to other positions which, now radical, in the future will be conservative.

Not alone Reform's idealism, but as well the nature of social questions hinders reform from much success in its own name. It fails to analyze conditions; to locate causes; or locating them, it cannot control the remedy. As a rule, a given social evil or wrong is produced by causes far removed. Poverty may cause intemperance or vice versa; poor cooking at home or the personal faults of a wife may cause it; company may cause it, choice may cause it, as may despair, misfortune or shame. The temperance reformer is apt to ignore all of this and to propose one or two blanket remedies; prohibition and preaching chief among them. The degradation of a laborer's family may be due to personal fault, improvidence, poor management, natural calamity, villainy, or many other causes; shorter hours of work, higher wages or weekly payment of wages will scarcely remedy such a situation. Now reform, as a rule, is inclined to fail of such a careful analysis; it sees averages—which exist only in the mind—proposes average remedies and generally misses. In saying this, no reflection is made on the social value of measures such as those mentioned. The point is that Reform tends to miss causes, and hence it fails in applying remedies.

As said a moment ago, Reform sometimes succeeds in effecting the organization of a party. Thereby it falls below its ideals, for it attempts to work through institutions. It immediately shows signs of corruption, need of reform itself; so within the reform circle a radical and a conservative tendency will appear: "The reformers affirm the inward life, but they do not trust it, but use outward and vulgar means. They do not rely on precisely that strength which wins me to their cause; not on love, not on a principle, but on men, on multitudes, on circumstances, on money, on party; that is, on fear, on wealth, on pride." (Emerson). Reform's great error is in assuming that social wrongs are created by institutions and that they are cured by them. They are caused by *men*, and men alone can cure them. It is useless to take the crumbling brick that made an old house unsafe and try, by relaying it, to make a strong one. The evil is in the brick. "The fault is not in politics," said the Hon. Peter Sterling, "it is in humanity." The permanent limitations of the individual must mark the possibilities of reform; until those limitations are understood and computed as factors in every situation, reform is in vain. Mill discovered this, for he saw that the flaw in his life—he had hoped to reform the world—was a flaw in life itself.

With all these characteristics, Reform, nevertheless, is high, ethical and in purpose inspiring. It emphasizes the moral over the material; man over property. Its prominence in society insures progress and gives promise that ideals shall not perish, that hope shall not wane and that society shall long for perfection and peace, without which longing, no progress is possible.

The tendency of Reform to organize into party and its general failure to build a purely reform party suggest two further points of view, which may be of interest: namely, the psychological constitution of the individual reformer and of the reform party. The discussion of the reform spirit has been general; we may understand it better by coming closer to concrete reformers, even at the risk of some repetition.

A conviction is a wonderful thing. It transforms a being, becomes an absolute law, overthrows old standards and creates its own; it adjusts life to itself, seems even to call for a new psychology and to escape text book logic. To have seen—to think to have seen—one great vital human truth is the climax of life. It is such a vision that makes the apostle and the martyr. When this conviction has created a purpose and stimulated an ambition its conquest is complete. Now, there are small ideas and mighty ideas, small minds and great ones; real truths and ideal truths. When a powerful truth gets into a powerful mind that possesses "the sense of established facts," such a mind shows balance, power, concrete mas-

tery, sympathetic knowledge of social forces and institutions. We then have the strongest type of statesmen: Richelieu, Fox, Bismarck, Gladstone. When a powerful truth gets into a powerful mind which seems not to have the "sense of established facts," but rather to dwell in an ideal order of things, such a mind shows profound insight, keen sense of ideal relation, strong grasp of ethical ideals, uncorrected by the sense of the real limitations of life, or of the stern unyielding controlling processes of history. We then have the poet, prophet, ideal reformer, teacher: Ruskin, Carlyle, Tolstoi, Morris, Wordsworth, Maurice, Kingsley, possibly Henry George. When such men come into contact with an abuse which they set out to reform, they command great power and wage fierce war; as, for instance, is seen in Garrison and Phillips in the abolition movement. When a powerful truth gets into a small mind, or a narrow one, in which neither the ideal nor the real is understood, we have the enthusiast, agitator, fanatic, crank. Hawthorne says somewhere that powerful truth is like the rich grape juice expressed from the vineyard of the ages and that it has an intoxicating quality, except when imbibed by a powerful intellect. The will to dominate may be as great in one as in another, the subjective views, as clear, but the last named class, lacking power, understanding and self-control comes into view and attracts much attention; hence through it public opinion makes its estimate of all social reform and reformers.

The presumption is, generally, that any one interested in reform work is a crank. A witness before the Senate Committee on Labor and Capital in 1883, a man of national reputation, began his evidence by some remarks, made "to save his reputation and prevent himself from being considered a crank" (Vol. III., p. 342 Report). Another witness produced the following clipping from a newspaper: (ibid, 385). "The great majority of its witnesses are visionaries and cranks, each of whom has a panacea for curing all the ills of society. The basis of the panacea is always the same. It is that somebody should give something for nothing, and that the author of the scheme should be enabled to live in luxury without work. There has not been such an opportunity for universal babblement . . . for many moons, and all crankdom is stirred and encouraged." Then recently a circular advertising the Report of the Trust Conference in Chicago in 1899 took care to assure us that "The cranks and demagogues were absent. The speakers were eminently sane, and indulged in no threats nor forebodings, nor pessimism nor despair." The class is surely numerous, but such reformers are not understood. We should study them sympathetically because they are the final typical products of the psychological influences in all reform.

Taking up this class then, our reformer is a man of one idea; as has been said of the crank, "he sees one thing clearly but not in its relations." A well-known newspaper man quotes a prominent public leader as defining a moral crank to be one who believes what he says. This one thought, conviction, purpose or whatever we may call it, has so thoroughly mastered our reformer that it fixes the centre and circumference of his life. Self-sacrificing in all things that further his purpose, he is intolerant and uncompromising beyond it. Everything is judged by relation to the master thought. In the view of a reformer, for instance, drink causes all social evils, abstinence will cure them; in another, competition is the root of all evil, coöperation eradicates it entirely; in another ignorance causes all vice, education will prevent it; in another separation of industry and religion is the fundamental wrong, the gospel alone applied to industry can bring relief. In every case, where the psychological process has worked unchecked, all of the complexities of social existence are simplified into one process; all social problems have one cause, and all possibilities of human development are seen in the one remedy. Maurice, who seems to have been a gentle but intense reformer, once said: "People sometimes find fault with me because I don't constantly say new things. I never had but one or two things I wanted to say, and I have all my life been trying to say them over and over again in different ways." (*Contemporary Review*, Vol. 65, article on Maurice.)

All of this implies that the reformer is an enthusiast, bouyant with faith in himself and his work, restless in propaganda and tireless in personal exertion. Hence he has no dread of opposition or of persecution. In fact, he courts it. Liebknecht's months in jail in Germany strengthened him greatly in his leadership of Socialism; it is said that Garibaldi held out as inducements to young Italians, poverty, hardships, battles and wounds, before victory. Higginson says in *Contemporaries*: "When a man once falls into the habit of measuring merit by martyrdoms, . . . the best abused man seems nearest to sainthood." Few great causes in human history have been established without causing pain to their most ardent supporters.

The concentration of the reformer, the gradual turning of sympathy, ambition and taste toward his cherished ideal, tends to destroy the sympathy, ambitions and tastes by which the average man is anchored in his place in society. Social position, friends, business affiliations, religious associates will in many cases be surrendered and supplanted by the fellowship of reform alone. Possibly nothing in our recent reform history is more pathetic than the isolation that came to Garrison and Phillips during abolition days. One of the

orators who spoke at the services over Altgeld in Chicago, after his death, Mr. Darrow, said:

"John P. Altgeld, like many of the earth's great souls, was a solitary man. Life to him was serious and earnest—an endless tragedy. The earth was a great hospital of sick, wounded and suffering, and he a devoted surgeon who had no right to waste one moment's time and whose duty was to cure them all. While he loved his friends, he yet could work without them, he could live without them, he could bid them one by one good-by when their courage failed to follow where he led, and he could go alone out into the silent night, and, looking upward at the changeless stars, could find communion there." Ruskin says in *Fors*, notes to Letter 76, that he had to maintain himself against the contradiction of everyone of his best friends. "Being entirely at one in my views of Nature and life with every great classic author, I am yet alone in the midst of a modern crowd which rejects them all."

An immediate penalty of this isolation is seen when reformers tend to become unconventional, even eccentric. Hence we hear of the "fringe of oddities" that ornaments reform. Hair, beard, habits of dress and of speech serve well to express to the world the presence of a reformer or of a party, as seen, for instance, in the abolition movement, the Quakers, or to some extent, in the Populist movement.

Another seeming result of this isolation is, the gradual loss of the sense of humor. The world is a hospital, life a tragedy, the reformer's duty, solemn. There is no time for laughter, no sympathy for mirth. The trait may be due in part to the general fact of concentration, for we notice that men in every walk of life, tend to become less jovial as they become intense. The entire absence of humor was remarkable in the physicist, Rowlands. No doubt, however, it is due to the specific temperament of the reformer and the nature of his thinking and feeling. A writer in the *Contemporary* (Vol. 78), in an admirable article on Ruskin seems to explain the phenomenon satisfactorily: "Cultivated minds dislike vehemence, and having been long familiar with heroes, crave in their intellectual food, the variety and stimulus afforded by cuisine; they are aware of the pain that lies about all grave questions and welcome any alleviation of their gravity. But when, as now, the prophet's constituency is widened to include thousands in whom this degree of cultivation is impossible; when new millions endowed every unit of them with the ancient passions, are pushing for their place, are demanding their satisfaction upon the narrowing circle of our habitable globe, and their pressure has unmeasurably increased the gravity of the problems to be dealt with—a leader of thought will jest at his peril.

Rather he should be incapable of jesting; he should be wholly possessed by an earnestness and intensity of feeling commensurate with the tremendous issues hanging in the balance. . . . The masses of struggling men and women to whom their names and something of their work were known, loved and revered them chiefly because they believed in their sincerity and compassion, believed them incapable of sitting like Epicurean gods in the circle of their golden chairs and looking down upon

. . . The fierce confederate storm of sorrow barricaded evermore
Within the walls of cities,

as a joke.

Nevertheless we do find some exceptions among reformers. Maurice relished humor, Wesley was always bright and cheerful, and those who knew the genial Ignatius Donnelly never tired of listening to his witty speech. The absence of the sense of humor, however, generally remarked in advanced reformers, handicaps them because it puts them out of sympathy with life and invites ridicule from the public. Man is always *ens risible*.

When the normal tendencies of reform have developed fully, a reform habit of mind is engendered. Reformers acquire the mental habit of protest. Vocabulary, sympathy, feeling belong to the reform order, the search for sorrow and the blight of sin are familiar, the degradation of man and the disappointments of life have been thought about, talked about, dreamt about until the reformer finds neither rest, nor peace, nor joy, except in their atmosphere. Hence when A sees his first ambition satisfied, his reform established in whole or in part, he does not return to ordinary pursuits and to the normal view of life as perhaps, Cincinnatus did. He looks for something else to reform. Garrison became an abolitionist, then anti-constitution, anti-government, anti-church.

Phillips was an abolitionist, then in succession an advocate of woman's rights, a temperance worker, a pleader for Ireland's cause, a labor leader, finally a currency reformer. In fact, he identified himself with every reform of his age. Another reformer now before the public was first a temperance reformer, later he devoted his energies to the Sabbath reform, then to labor, anti-lottery, woman's suffrage, civil service and ballot reform. This development is generally in the direction of radicalism. We find many who passed successively through the labor movement from conservative to radical, then into single tax work, socialism, finally, into anarchy. Whatever be the relations of these reforms logically or objectively, that they are psychologically closely identified is beyond question.

The Reformer is apt to think that the world is against him. Con-

vinced of his own ability and wisdom, he unconsciously identifies himself with his cause; his reformed world is one which primarily gives his talent free play and exalts him to a commanding position. After the Kaweah Colony of Reformers in California failed, one of its officers wrote of it: (Out West, September, 1902.) "Every man who came here, with but few exceptions, came under the belief that his particular talents and abilities had not been properly recognized in the outside world; that a capitalistic cabal or conspiracy there existed against him and that here in Kaweah his merits would be instantly noted and that he would at once assume his natural position as a leader of affairs." Of course, such a revelation of this trait could be looked for only in circumstances such as a reform colony presents. In a colony reform attempts to actualize itself and shape life.

There are many more traits which one might mention, were it not too tedious and apt to distract the reader from the main point. For instance: the loss of mental and moral perspective in the mind of the reformer; the forgetfulness of self seen in the beginning and the omnipresence of self seen in the end; the high ethical character of the ends of reformers and the questionable means so often employed; the strange association of pessimism and optimism which so many writers note.

Reformers are much inclined to fellowship among themselves. The common fate of isolation which society inflicts on them, likeness of temperament and sympathetic attitude on many problems, would naturally favor the habit of association among them. Differences of culture, faith, disposition or wealth seem not to hinder the strangest sort of fellowship. This was seen in the composition of the Kaweah Colony referred to above. The writer quoted says it was "the United States in miniature; among the members are old and young, rich and poor, wise and foolish, educated and ignorant, worker and professional." "There were temperance men and their opposites, churchmen and agnostics, free thinkers, Darwinists and spiritualists; bad poets and good, musicians, artists, prophets and priests. There were dress reform cranks and phonetic spelling fanatics, word purists and vegetarians. It was a mad, mad world and being so small, its madness was the more visible." A common ideal, one great hope, one controlling impulse drew them together and blinded them to the permanent and deep reaching differences which would hinder unity forever. The same seems to have been the fate of nearly all if not all of the colony efforts of our socialist reformers. The same has been the case with reform parties and even reform conventions from time immemorial. Temperance workers, the abolition movement, Populists, Socialists, Anarchists,

offer no exception. Hawthorne, who lived in a time of great reform activity, when reform numbered distinguished men and women among its champions, sadly remarks in the *Procession of Life*: "It is harder to contrive a friendly arrangement of these brethren of love and righteousness in the procession of life than to unite even the wicked who indeed are chained together by their crimes. The fact is too preposterous for tears, too lugubrious for laughter."

A party in social or political life is generally a compromise; the platform represents no one fully, but it does represent many, partially. No two thinking men think alike, nor could they ever agree if they attempted to express their views on everything. No dozen men agree entirely on anything. Leaders in a party pay due attention to this. They study with care the trend of thought and feeling and construct platforms with a professed view to victory over opponents rather than to the expression of truth as such. Hence a platform must please all; it need represent no one accurately. Much will be sacrificed in principle declaration or purpose, in order to avoid schism or to win doubtful adherents. Then when compromise is made and the platform is adopted, little attention is paid to it except in as far as opponents challenge it or orators use it for purposes of campaign.

The conservative is past master in the art of party organization. Lincoln was credited with the possession of the last great secret of politics; that of going twain willingly with those who had compelled him to go an unwilling mile. The reformer's deeper impulse is to say everything that he thinks and to have thoughts on everything that presents itself to his mind. He is always positive, always a propagandist; he always insists that those with whom he deals think as he thinks. Consequently he does not understand the art of compromise and he fails as a builder of parties. He may make verbal compromises in the attempt to organize a party, but in so doing he does not alter views or minimize his demands. On the contrary, he forces his views on every one, without discrimination. In view of this truth the history of reform parties is not surprising. All kinds of reformers will flock together and join any new party which seems to promise victory. The result is a combination of warring elements that insures prompt disaster. The National Social and Political Conference held in Buffalo June, 1899, framed a platform which at the time was described as a "second-hand lumber yard." Another convention of the same sort held in Louisville in April, 1902, was composed of delegates from the following parties: The Public Ownership Party of Missouri, Independent Labor Party, and of Socialists, Fusionists, Silver Democrats, Silver Republicans "and others." There were three hundred delegates from twenty States

who aimed "To build a platform large enough for all reform parties, large enough for all the reform men, women and children of the United States to stand upon." Conservatives would have aimed to make the platform vague enough to offend no one, and small to cause no embarrassment. The convention spent most of its time and energy in wrangling over a name. It has not been heard of since.

The history of the Populist Party illustrates the whole exposition of reform which has been attempted in these pages. There was in it much that was honest, noble, timely, and even hopeful. It seemed to promise to meet a national need which had been ignored by our great parties, but it quickly went the way of its predecessor, the Greenback Party, and it is now scarcely more than memory. It swallowed up nearly every small reform movement in the country, counting within its ranks Anarchists, Socialists of all schools, Labor Unionists, Grangers and Farmers' Alliance men, Greenbackers, Prohibitionists and Single Taxers. Its rise to power was phenomenal; it leaped into existence; placed representatives in both houses of Congress and secured the balance of power there, controlled many states and at least one university. In 1892 it polled over a million votes and seemed to promise much in the way of reform. But its disintegration was as rapid as its rise. The platform proclaimed the utter desolation of the land, the total bankruptcy of our institutions and the entire depravity of the party in power. It declared that every wrong should be righted and the equal rights should be established for all. The convention of 1892 isolated the party from the healthy sentiment of the nation so completely that it was doomed. While politicians had been frightened, the public had been amused, and the humorous columns of our newspapers had been furnished with abundant material for ridicule and wit. The great convention was described by a metropolitan daily as a "collection of wild-eyed cranks, an enormous aggregation of life failures, the collarless contingent, men of low degree with ill-fitting clothes." The party showed great depth of feeling, much honesty of purpose and intense idealism. Schism appeared, then mutual suspicion, then abuse. Corruption followed, then fusion with any party, in order to share the spoils. Its ambition was soon brought down from the service of an ideal to the service of self, and then life flickered out quickly. Its greatest service was rendered in its failure. It taught us that noble ideas cannot overcome the laws of social life and the limitations of our nature, that reform must study the latter more, and the first much less, if it would contribute effectively to the uplifting of man.

The case is the same with the Socialists. We have in the United

States many types: the philanthropic, the Fabian, the Philosophic, the Christian socialist, the economic socialist, the colonizer. Agreeing in the essential element of socialism, they constantly disagree in detail, abuse one another and show far more bad temper, suspicion and abuse than the prosaic conservatives who admittedly stand on a far lower plane of ethical profession. The socialists are all equally idealistic, all see with equal clearness the social iniquity against which they protest, but all miss the reality, the modifications of principle imposed upon men by nature, and the slow devious ways in which social forces work.

Naturally some reform parties do acquire stability and become factors in a nation, but very probably one would find upon examination that external circumstances and practical measures which are not specific to reform give such a party most of the strength which it may show.

This study of the subjective side of Reform may aid one to understand the serious nature of the whole problem and to estimate more accurately the varieties of representatives which the cause possesses. An objective study of the facts in the social situation, an analysis of elements in it and a view of the permanent limitations to which all reform will ever be exposed, would be required to complete the subject. Such a study can lead to but one result—one sometimes noticed and rarely appreciated in its full significance, namely that there can be and will be no social reform without individual reform; there will be no individual reform that is not moral and religious; there will be no religious reform of the individual until he recognizes that soul is higher than mind or body; that conscience is more sacred than power or wealth, self-respect more precious than learning, service of fellow man nobler than self-seeking and service of God noblest of all.

The social question is a religious question; social reform is religious reform. Possibly a development of these thoughts will be attempted in a subsequent article.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

HISTORY OF SCHOOLS—A SUPPRESSED CHAPTER.

IT is not always prudent to ask a hearing for an old story. But there are also occasions when we are pushed to a repetition of tales which we had most prudently taken to be only too well known. Not so very long ago, in the work of teaching Catechism to stray boys who had not made their First Communion, we were visited by a lad who was what we are now beginning to call a graduate of a grammar school. His name might have belonged to an Irish king; and he had received the faith in baptism. We tried to learn the Baltimore Catechism by heart; but it would not go. The words were new and the pronunciation was hard. So we had to go at it again by simply reading aloud, and the explanations proceeded slowly as sentence after sentence could be read coherently. In the course of time we reached the end of the "Third Lesson." We were reading in *Number One*. "Lesson Fourth" has this heading: "On the Angels and our First Parents." And there occurred a dialogue:

Preceptor. The next time, we shall have something about what is called original sin, a sin that Adam committed. (*And playfully*) Did you ever hear of Adam?

Disciple. No, sir.

Preceptor (a little anxious at this revelation). Did you ever hear that the Blessed Virgin is the Mother of God?

Disciple. No, sir.

Preceptor. Did you ever hear that Christ died for us upon a cross?

Disciple. No, sir.

Now, this was a case in which an old story had to be told over again. The boy's mind was historically vacant down to beyond the beginning of days. So we took out a huge quarto Douay Bible, and began where "the earth was void and empty, and darkness was upon the face of the deep," and we worked our way along to the eating of the forbidden fruit.

Since these events transpired we do not know how many millions of dollars have been poured into the elementary schools. In the three years there have been educational bequests to the sum of two hundred and sixty-three millions, and the multiplied library foundations are beaming as so many auroras at the book companies. But with all these advantages we doubt whether the grammar school graduate has yet been put upon a traject from the hypothetic nebluzæ to the garden of Eden. As we advance along educational grades we find kindred wonders of scholarship—and notably in matters of fact. We see that minds are being continuously trained to skirt

the rim of some great vacuum in so-called historical studies. The vacuum process is pursued with great energy even in the training of teachers. Indeed, this seems to be regarded as the most secure way of bringing about the result in the minds of the scholars. Nature, indeed, abhors a vacuum; but there is no telling what art can do.

In the pages of this *Review* (January, 1902), attention was called to the writings of M. Compayré, and to the mutilation of text to which he descends in order to sustain untruthful statement. A translation of M. Compayré's *History of Pedagogy* is in high honor in many Institutes where teachers are being formed for our schools. The author, himself, has been a very much patronized protégé of a government which has sought to achieve glory with pick-axe and battering-ram, by driving from their homes thousands of defenseless women whose pure lives had been consecrated to prayer and charity and to the silent uplifting of the heaviest part of the public burden. This association, alone, might mark the author's feeling towards the monastic name. But he took the pen and distilled his spirit into the printed page, as we can see from the analysis both of what he has written and of what he has left out. In the previous article we noted his malicious sneer at the monastery of St. Gall. Without any other mention of the establishment, he puts its entire glorious history of seven centuries into a single sentence: "In 1291 of all the monks in the convent of St. Gall, there was only one who could read and write." The American translator, as we remarked, says that there was not even one monk who could read or write. Now, the fact is that the traditional reference in this matter does not speak of the monks at all. It speaks of the *Chapter*. In 1291, the *Chapter* had been taken possession of by civil princes, and this *Chapter* had been stocked with fighting men. These men were thrust into orders that they might be given the position, and they did not even live in the monastery. But we have discussed this question elsewhere.

Upon the same page (p. 55, Edition 1901), speaking of the centuries between St. Jerome and Charlemagne, M. Compayré writes: "If the first doctors of the Church occasionally showed some sympathy for profane letters, it was because, in their youth, before having received baptism, they themselves had attended the pagan schools. But when these schools were closed Christianity opened no others, and after the fourth century a profound night covered humanity." Here we beg leave to tell once more the old story of how the bridge was built over the awful chasm between civilization and civilization.

I.

During just one thousand years Rome had been expanding from

the condition of a shepherd's hut where Romulus and Remus were reared upon the slope of the Aventine beside the Tiber. After the thousand years, Rome embraced the world. She had absorbed the learning of Greece, the conquests of Alexander, the trade of Tyre and Carthage, the granaries of the three Continents around her inland sea. Her name and her language were upon distant cities which she had either conquered or founded: Lyons, Arles, Cordova, Carthage, Cologne, Jerusalem, London. Amid all the splendor of empire the old Roman stock decayed, was dying—dying from causes that will bring extinction to any race, causes that are decimating polished societies to-day. The Emperor Commodus had ascended the throne and had given an illustration of cruelty and debauchery truly imperial in the records of individual crime. In one hundred years, from Commodus to Diocletian (284), eighty Emperors rose and fell and only two or three of them died a natural death. The Roman stock was rotten, and these Emperors were barbarian generals who had been trained to Roman arms—Africans, Moors, Scythians, Arabs, Thracians, Pannonians and Goths.

But with her world-wide sway, with her magnificent roadways and water-ways that led from the Forum into three Continents, and with all her efforts to recruit her disappearing high society from the lower, Rome stood helpless when the deluge came. The barbarians had felt her weakness and were closing in upon her. Even as early as the year 260, the legend goes, the Emperor Valerian, captured by King Sapor, was executed and flayed; and his skin, painted red, was hung up in a Parthian shrine as a warning to the queen city that sat upon the seven hills. In a century's time the tribes that had formed the armies of the Empire began to aspire to empire and to move up to the borders. With the Parthians and Saracens on the east, there were the Quadi and the Sarmatians above the Black Sea, and the Huns beyond. Along the Rhine and across the Danube there had gathered the Franks, the Suevi, the Germans, the Lombards, the Saxons, the Heruli, the Vandals, the Gepidæ, the Burgundians, the Goths and the Alans. The day of Daniel's prophecy was at hand. Civil wars arose throughout the Empire. Then there were plagues and famine and earthquakes. And the flood came. It was not a deluge of water. It was a deluge of fire and blood, of tribe after tribe, and race after race. There was darkness over the earth. It was the most terrible scourge that humanity had ever beheld.

There were let loose upon the Empire the nations which God had reserved for the day of His vengeance. The work of ten centuries seemed to go to ruin in a day. The barriers were broken and the flood-gates were opened on every side; and there poured in not merely upon the outlying border provinces of the Empire, but over

all its most typical seats of learning and luxury and magnificence, a long pent up torrent of carnage and desolation. So it went on until, in 410, Alaric with his Goths swept like a burning tempest over the peninsula of Italy, sacking and devastating the imperial city. The infants of that awful time had come to be but of middle age when Attila, calling himself the scourge of God, mustered his restless Huns, three-quarters of a million of them, at the base of the Ural Mountains, and cut a swath across the continent of Europe, until from the Gallic seacoast he looked out upon the billows of the Atlantic. As he stood before the impregnable fortress of Orleans, Aetius, the last of the Romans, called in the Franks and the Visigoths, fell upon the Hun, and drove him back, step by step, over the width of France into the great plains of Chalons in Champagne. And here the two armies about equal in numbers, Frank and Gaul and Visigoth on one side, and Hun upon the other, the greatest armies that have ever faced one another on a single battle field, fought hand to hand. One-third of the Hunnish army was left there to fertilize the champaign of Chalons; the remaining half million was hurled back across the Rhine.

Attila was stunned, but in the next year he was on the march, mowing his way down through Germany and Switzerland and northern Italy. As he neared Mantua there came out to him the Vicar of Christ, a Leo, the man of God to the scourge of God. And Leo told him in the name of God not to lay his finger upon Rome which had become the city of God's anointed. Right there, the swarthy Hun turned back. His work was done. He led his army over the Alps and died leaving to the world no trace of his tomb or of a kingdom.

In the meantime the north of Africa, the garden of the Roman Empire and the garden of her vices, had been swept by the Vandals. As if the visitations of Alaric and Attila had not been enough, Genseric must lead his Vandals across to the northern shore. And they went over like a cloud of locusts to see if, perchance, there might still be some sinews glued to the dismembered corpse of empire. It was only two years after the departure of Attila that Genseric entered the city of Rome. St. Leo persuaded him to spare the city from fire and blood and to be satisfied with a tribute. But the work of the Vandals was accomplished. They had gone over into Africa from the north, to transplant their ruggedness into that bower of Roman vice, and in half a century from the day when Genseric stood before St. Leo in Rome, the Vandals were no longer a nation. To-day, after fourteen hundred years, we employ the term, *vandalism*, as our strongest expression for the spirit of ravage and destruction and wanton ruin. And so the story goes on. Any recollection that

had been left of the scarlet woman even in distant Britain was lost in the bloody raids of Picts and Scots, of Angles and Saxons.

So, tribe followed tribe and race followed race, coursing hither and thither over the prostrate form of imperial magnificence. They did not care to rest in fair fields and by flowing streams which might have been theirs simply for the staying. It seemed they could not rest so long as there was a barrier beyond to be levelled or a province to be overrun. And when the work to which Providence had sent them was done, they stopped just where they found themselves; people separated from people by the natural boundaries of what were to be the states of modern Europe. The Visigoths were in Spain; the Franks were in upper Gaul; the Burgundians were between; the Ostrogoths were in Lombardy; the Allemanni, Bavarians, Saxons and various other tribes were scattered over the territory lying between the Alps and the northern sea.

II.

Now, in the very olden time, in the days of a civilization that went before the civilization of the Roman Empire, there was known to exist an island to the west of Britain and to the north of Gaul. This island was spoken of by the Phoenicians and the Mediterranean mariners of old as the "western island." Plutarch speaks of it as entering into what was ancient history in his time. We have not to consider its very ancient history; but the Annals of the Four Masters certainly stand solitary and majestic amid all purely human records. The people of the island had their own alphabet 1500 years ago and were writing history in it then. Their preservation of genealogies after the style of the book of Genesis indicates their antiquity and the truth of the record that they came from the orient. Sir W. K. Sullivan says: "Circumstances were favorable in Ireland to the growth and preservation of ethnic legends. Amongst these favorable circumstances were the long continuance of tribal government and the existence of a special class whose duty it was to preserve the genealogies of the ruling families and keep in memory the deeds of their ancestors. . . . With all their drawbacks, the Irish ethnic legends, when stripped of their elaborate details and Biblical and classical loans express the broad facts of the peopling of Ireland and are in accordance with archæological investigation." (*Encyc. Brit. art. Ireland*, pp. 243, 244.)

In the third century this island was known as Scotia, and its people as the Scoti, or Scots. They had planted colonies in the north of the island of Britain; and the north of Britain is, to this day, called Scotland. In 439, Pope St. Celestine sent out Palladius as

Bishop over the Scots believing in Christ. Little is known of the mission of Palladius. Shortly after, there came to Scotia a certain Patricius, a scion of one of patrician houses of Rome. He is known to us as Patrick. He had twice been a captive on the island; and, upon his release he betook himself to study, that he might return to labor for the conversion of his captors. He is said to have gone to Tours, and to have been the nephew of St. Martin, the Bishop of Tours. He is also spoken of as having studied under St. Germanus at Auxerre; then, at some islands in the Mediterranean, evidently the islands of Lerins; and, finally, at Rome. He was consecrated Bishop and started back to Scotia or Ireland. The inhabitants followed the doctrines of druidism. Their chief object of worship seems to have been the sun. But there is absolutely no record of the bloodiness of Gaulish druidism among them; and neither is there any indication that they were tainted with the cruelty and immorality that we find in Grecian and Roman paganism.

One of the chief works of Patrick was the establishment of schools. Some affirm that he established schools in as many as one hundred localities. It is certain that he founded what was afterwards the noted school of Armagh. A few items about the Irish schools may serve to open the eyes of many who are preparing themselves to be teachers by studying the history of education. The story of the Irish schools is an essential key to the history of modern civilization. We can here merely hint at a few facts. "Within a century after the death of St. Patrick," says Bishop Nicholson, "the Irish seminaries had so increased that most parts of Europe sent their children to be educated there, and drew thence their bishops and teachers." Elsewhere, as history shows us, Christianity, on its introduction, encountered the axe of the persecutor. Here it only roused enthusiasm for the study of letters and the practice of the religious life. An immense territory around Leighlin was called the "land of saints and scholars," and soon the whole island was known abroad as the "island of saints and of doctors." The schools of the isle of Aran, Aran of the flowers, which became Aran of the saints, were founded in 480, four years after the absolute breakdown of the Roman power in the west. The school of Aran was a noted resort for students from the Continent, for it was the home of great masters. Here Kieran and Brendan taught; and also Fursey, before he went out to found his schools in England and in France. Hither, too, did Columba (Columkil), poet, artist, founder, intrepid missionary, betake himself to breathe its soft atmosphere of holiness and science, before he went out to his work amid the northern storms. About the year 530, Finian began the schools of Clonard in Westmeath, and lived to see the scholars there number three thousand. Kieran and Bren-

dan and Columba studied under this Finian at Clonard. In 548, Kieran went out to found the celebrated school of Clon-mac-nois, the retreat of the sons of the noble, on the banks of the Shannon. Fintan founded the school of the Ivy Cave at the foot of Mount Bladin in Queen's county. From the Ivy Cave went Saint Comgall, who established the renowned school of Benchor near the bay of Carrickfergus, in 559. Benchor numbered three thousand. St. Bernard speaks of it as having sent out a swarm of saints into foreign lands, and its most illustrious scholar was Columbanus, the apostle of Burgundy and Italy. From it also came Luanus, who founded the school of Clonfert in Leinster. There was another Clonfert, founded by Brendan in Connaught. Brendan is a poetic name. Some may regard as a legend his seven years' voyage and his discovery of a land across the western ocean. But it was the most popular legend of the middle ages. Christopher Columbus was strengthened in his belief of a land to the west by this very legend, as also by the book of the Irishman, Feargil, or Virgil, on the rotundity of the earth, written seven centuries before the first voyage of Columbus. To illustrate the numbers that attended the school of Brendan, at Clonfert in Connaught, the story was told that the master, one day, whilst out for a stroll, lost his book, and discovered the loss only on his return. The scholars set out immediately in search of it. The master had been to the top of a neighboring hill. The fleetest runner arrived there first, picked up the book, and then simply passed it down the line until it was put into the hands of Brendan.

All this we find in the sixth century, only one hundred years from the death of St. Patrick. But take the complete record of the sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth and eleventh centuries. Schools sprang up, as it were like towns, Bangor and Clonard and Birr had each three or four thousand students. In the ninth century there were seven thousand students at Armagh; and it had its rivals at Lismore and Cashel and Dindaleathglass. So extensive did the University of Armagh become that it was eventually divided into three sections; and one section was devoted to the Anglo-Saxon students. In the eighth century it was endowed by the Kings of Ireland, and it survived the devastations of the Danes in the ninth and tenth centuries, rising up from its ashes. And we read in the statues of Clonard, in the eleventh century, that no one shall be allowed to teach in the other universities who has not studied at Armagh. We have here cold, unassailable facts. The settling peoples gazed and wondered. The students came flocking from every clime. The learning which they could not find at home, in the bustle of migration and war, they knew they would find in the island

of saints and doctors. Schools were everywhere; whole cities were turned into schools where religion lent a sacred character to study. There was the German, the Cimbrian, the Frank, the Pict, the Italian. They came in thousands and tens of thousands to hear from the lips of the Irish scholars the lore of the olden time and to study in the lives of saintly men the true interpretation of Christian morality and Christian perfection.

Bede, a Saxon historian of the seventh century, speaking of the numbers that went over from England to Ireland, says: "They were all most freely admitted, and supplied gratis with daily sustenance, books and masters." MacPherson says that "in the fifth, sixth and seventh centuries religion and learning flourished to such a degree in Ireland that it was commonly styled the mother country of saints, and reputed the kingdom of arts and sciences." Camden, writing in the sixteenth century, says: "Our Anglo-Saxons went, in those times, to Ireland, as to a fair, to purchase knowledge, and we find in our authors that, when a person was absent, it was generally said of him, by way of proverb, that he was sent to Ireland to receive his education."

III.

But it did not all remain at home; nor did the Irish Doctors wait for others to come to them. As early as 563, Columba, after founding two schools, went in a wicker boat with twelve companions, over to Scotland. Conall, King of the Albanian Scots, bestowed upon him the island of I or Hi, which we know as Iona, in the western Hebrides. Here he laid the foundation of what was to be the most celebrated school in western Europe. As many as three hundred schools were, in the course of time, established from it. Then, there is the other Columba (Columbanus) called the father of the Irish missionaries. He journeyed through France, Germany and Switzerland and died in Italy where his name rests to-day upon an Italian town. His companion, St. Gall, whom he left behind, an invalid, amongst the Germans of Switzerland, set himself to evangelize and civilize the tribes of the Allemanni. His hut, by the Steinach, became the nucleus of a town; then of a state, called after him; and his name is still upon the city of St. Gall. How many readers of to-day will recognize as Irish the names of the scholars who went out to labor among the pagan tribes? Here are a few of them. St. Frigidian was twenty-eight years bishop of Lucca, in Italy; and the church of that city is still called after him. St. Livinus was a bishop and martyr in Flanders. St. Arbogast was bishop of Strasburg in Germany. St. Cathal was bishop of Tarentum in Italy; he has left his name to the town of San Cataldo. His

brother, St. Donatus, was bishop of Lecce in the kingdom of Naples, and also bishop of Fiesole in Tuscany. St. Sedulius was bishop of Oretó in Spain, whither he had been sent on an ecclesiastical mission by Pope Gregory the Second. There is St. Albuin, bishop of Buraburg, near Fritzlar in Saxony. Then we have St. Rumold of Mechlin, or Malines, in Belgium. He was the son of the king of Leinster. He resigned his right of succession to become a religious and a student. He was made bishop of Dublin. He went to Rome and handed his episcopal ring to Pope Stephen the Second, and begged to be allowed to go out to the conversion of the tribes. He journeyed up to where the Scheldt pours into the northern sea, and planted his cross amid the thickets and the marsh. Upon that spot now stands the city of Malines, and the Cathedral of Malines, one of the most exquisite and most venerable monuments of the world's architecture, is dedicated under his patronage. Upon the Rhine, between Basel and Schaffhausen, we pass the town of Saeckingen. The very air here is fragrant with the praises of the Irishman Fridolin. Fridolin—we meet his name at Metz, at Strasburg, along the Moselle, at Eller on the Rhine, and even in Burgundy. Schiller has sung his praises,

Ein frommer Knecht war Fridolin;

and in the masterpiece, "Der Trompeter von Saeckingen," the great bard, Scheffel, pours out the well-springs of his art over Fridolin whom he makes the patron of his hero. Again, in the choir of the church of Rheinau in Switzerland we see the tomb of St. Fintan who founded a school there more than a thousand years ago. The very name of Bridget is testimony to the widespread influence of the Irish scholars abroad. The memory of this daughter of Hibernia is kept in special veneration at Seville, Lisbon, Placentia, Tours, Besancon, Namur in Belgium, Quimper, Gien, Venice, Mayence, Treves, Wurzburg, Constance, Strasburg, Cologne and many other places. The whole country around Ghent is under the patronage of St. Livinus. And on the 8th of July, 1889, forty thousand strangers gathered into the city of Wurtzburg to celebrate the anniversary of Killian, who founded his school there twelve hundred years ago.

Now, what of all this? It is an exhibition of the providence of God over humanity. The barbarians had swept over every inch of ground that was tainted with the Roman vice that followed Roman rule. But the Roman eagles were never planted on the Hibernian coast. Tacitus tells us that the conquest of the island was once proposed by the General Agricola; but the project was never entered into by the Senate. So, also, when the barbarians, in the mission which they did not understand, were obliterating every trace of

Roman rule, even in the island of Britain, they did not think of crossing the channel to the western island. And thus it was that when Rome was laid waste and the grass grew upon the marble balustrades of imperial villas, when the fierce barbarians watered their horses in the Tiber and stabled them in the patrician palaces and gorgeous temples of the desolated empire, the tidal wave never reached the green shores of the land of future promise. So, whilst great centres of pagan culture in Europe, Asia and Africa were sharing the fate of the Empire, and libraries were being used for fuel on the ground that the Koran was book enough, Ireland was, beginning with the fifth century and through the sixth, seventh, eighth and ninth centuries, and up to the very day of the coming of the Dane, the peaceful home of religion and the nursery of science and of art. Providence had made timely choice of this far-off land wherein the lamp of a divinely lighted science might burn with tranquil flame, and preparation be made for a new order of civilization that was to be created amongst new peoples.

The men to whom this work was committed were monks, and they were school men. But their schooling was very broad. Manual occupation entered into their daily life. Take this same St. Gall's during the centuries of which we are speaking. It had a department for every trade and art—agriculture, smelting, weaving, carving, and even boat-building. Nearly all in the Irish schools were skilled at the forge. These men, besides being educators in letters, were civilizers in every sense. They taught the people they went to, all the arts of peace. They went from study and writing to manual work as their exercise and recreation. The hand that forged the plow often wrote those delicate pages which form the greatest treasures of our modern libraries. The book of Kells, written 1500 years ago, most probably by the Columba of Iona, shows, even under the microscope, a freshness and brilliancy in its colored illustrations and illuminations, which give it the appearance of a production of yesterday. These men were logicians and mathematicians; and nowhere do we find rhyme earlier than in their poems; so that we often see rhyme alluded to as the "art of the Irish."

These, then, were the men who went out amongst the tribes that were moving. When one colony was destroyed, another hurried to the breach. Thus, during those centuries, they labored. In the meantime, they joined hands with the sons of St. Benedict who came up from the mountain rock of Casino, and together they Christianized and civilized the tribes as these settled; and thus they made it possible for Charlemagne to find a body of Christian peoples who would accept him for their high lord suzerain. In just four centuries from the descent of Alaric, on Christmas day in the year 800,

Charlemagne was crowned Emperor over all the peoples occupying the territory of modern Europe that lies between the North Sea and Naples and between the Balkans and Gibraltar. And the crown was put upon him by the Pope, at Rome, in the Church of St. Peter. Through this territory civil governments had been established by the Saxons, Bavarians, Suevi, Burgundians, Franks, Lombards, Visigoths, Allemanni, etc., within the boundaries which are occupied by their descendants to-day. How had the original confusion been reduced even so far into order? This is the chapter that is simply suppressed in the books that are put into the hands of the students of education to-day. Barbarous tribes had been transformed into *citizens*. This is precisely what had been done with them. And "citizenship" is the shibboleth of the present hour. The barbarians had been made *civics*. Roving tribes that lived in war camps had been made the inhabitants of cities. They had their own civil governments within fixed territories. They had their codes of laws and their courts, and they had what we are striving for, a central court of arbitration. In our one hundred and twenty-five years of existence, when our civilization has come in contact with the tribes, it has corrupted them or exterminated them. That old education which took account of the whole man, of immortal soul as well as body, of eternity as well as time, fashioned whole peoples into citizenship out of the very rawest material. Our new education, which ignores the better half of human nature and of human duration, cannot keep men in the spirit of a citizenship with which it finds them endowed.

IV.

But we had only to tell a story; and it has been told. It has a sequel; but that does not concern us here except merely to state that when the providential office of the schools had been exercised, the schools, themselves, of the western island began to disappear. In the year 790, or just ten years before Charlemagne was crowned as Emperor in the new civilization, the Danes landed in Ireland. Schools and churches were levelled. They rose again. They were burned again and again. The students and doctors were slaughtered or dispersed. For two hundred and twenty-five years, with breathing intervals, did the war go on. At length there arose a great Christian warrior who in his seventy-sixth year drove the last of the Danish invaders into the sea. But then came the mail-clad Anglo-Norman who built castles instead of schools. How he fixed his hold upon the land is history. Then the Anglo-Norman abjured his faith, and the island of saints and doctors became the island of martyrs. Here we come upon the book of Ireland's trial. We need

not open it. It is dripping with blood. Its cover is as the funeral shroud, the winding sheet of an ancient race. Its table of contents are penal laws that might have been dictated by the archfiend. Its lines are written in the life-stream of broken hearts and in gall of the bitterest sorrow. Its illustrations are ghastly scenes of flame and crime, of smoking thatch and slaughtered babe, and bones that bleach by the wayside as linen on the heather.

WILLIAM POLAND, S. J.

St. Louis University.

WHO WAS S. MARY MAGDALEN?

THERE is perhaps hardly any saint of God to whom men feel more drawn than to the heroic woman whose name stands in the title of this paper. "I came not to call the just but sinners" was the Divine announcement, and He proved it by the forgiveness of the Magdalen. He was "the Friend of publicans and sinners," not merely in the Pharisee's taunt, but in very deed, and wished to be known in history as such.

Amen I say to you, wheresoever this gospel shall be preached in the whole world, that also which she hath done, shall be told for a memorial of her.¹

Hence it is that all the Evangelists have dwelt with lingering pathos on that scene which portrayed so perfectly the character of the Saviour of the world—the woman kneeling at His feet and anointing Him as He said "beforehand . . . for the burial."

But though the scene thus described is so well known to us all, and though her name has passed into a bye-word, it is remarkable that the Gospel narrative is not very explicit as to the identity of S. Mary Magdalen. We find first of all "the woman that was a sinner in the city" then Mary Magdalen, then Mary of Bethany, the sister of Lazarus, and then again simply "Mary." Are all these one and the same person, or are they four different women?

A brief examination of the Gospel passages concerned may simplify the question.

And one of the Pharisees desired him to eat with him. And he went into the house of the Pharisee, and sat down to meat.

And behold a woman that was in the city, a sinner, when she knew that he sat at meat in the Pharisee's house, brought an alabaster-box of ointment;

And standing behind at his feet, she began to wash his feet with tears, and wiped them with the hairs of her head, and kissed his feet, and anointed them with the ointment.

And the Pharisee, who had invited him, seeing it, spoke within himself, saying:

¹ S. Mark xiv., 9.

This man, if he were a prophet, would know surely who and what manner of woman this is that toucheth him, that she is a sinner.

And Jesus answering, said to him: Simon, I have somewhat to say to thee. But he said: Master, say *it*.

A certain creditor had two debtors, the one owed him five hundred pence, and the other fifty.

And whereas they had not wherewith to pay, he forgave them both. Which therefore of the two loveth him most?

Simon answering said: I suppose that he to whom he forgave most. And he said to him: Thou hast judged rightly.

And turning to the woman, he said unto Simon: Dost thou see this woman? I entered into thy house, thou gavest me no water for my feet; but she with tears hath washed my feet, and with her hairs hath wiped them.

Thou gavest me no kiss; but she, since she came in, hath not ceased to kiss my feet.

My head with oil thou didst not anoint; but she with ointment hath anointed my feet.

Wherefore I say to thee: Many sins are forgiven her, because she hath loved much. But to whom less is forgiven, he loveth less.

And he said to her: Thy sins are forgiven thee.

And they that sat at meat with him began to say within themselves: Who is this that forgiveth sins also?

And he said to the woman: Thy faith hath made thee safe, go in peace.²

Now there was a certain man sick named Lazarus, of Bethania, of the town of Mary and of Martha her sister.

(And Mary was she that anointed the Lord with ointment and wiped his feet with her hair: whose brother Lazarus was sick.)

His sisters therefore sent to him, saying: Lord, behold, he whom thou lovest is sick.³

And it came to pass afterwards, that he traveled through the cities and towns, preaching and evangelizing the kingdom of God; and the twelve with him.

And certain women who had been healed of evil spirits and infirmities; Mary who is called Magdalen, out of whom seven devils were gone forth.⁴

Now it came to pass as they went, that he entered into a certain town; and a certain woman named Martha, received him into her house.

And she had a sister called Mary, who sitting also at the Lord's feet, heard his word.

But Martha was busy about much serving. Who stood and said: Lord, hast thou no care that my sister hath left me alone to serve? speak to her therefore, that she help me.

And the Lord answering, said to her: Martha, Martha, thou art careful, and art troubled about many things.

But one thing is necessary. Mary hath chosen the best part, which shall not be taken away from her.⁵

Jesus therefore six days before the pasch came to Bethania, where Lazarus had been dead, whom Jesus raised to life.

And they made him a supper there: and Martha served, but Lazarus was one of them that were at table with him.

Mary therefore took a pound of ointment of right spikenard, of great price, and anointed the feet of Jesus, and wiped his feet with her hair: and the house was filled with the odour of the ointment.

Then one of his disciples, Judas Iscariot, he that was about to betray him, said:

Why was not this ointment sold for three hundred pence and given to the poor?

Now he said this, not because he cared for the poor; but because he was a thief, and having the purse, carried the things that were put therein.

Jesus therefore said: Let her alone, that she may keep it against the day of my burial.

For the poor you have always with you; but me you have not always.⁶

And it came to pass, when Jesus had ended all these words, he said to his disciples:

You know that after two days shall be the pasch, and the son of man shall be delivered up to be crucified:

Then were gathered together the chief-priests and ancients of the people into the court of the high priest, who was called Caiphas:

And they consulted together, that by subtilty they might apprehend Jesus, and put him to death.

² S. Luke vii., 36-50.

³ S. Luke x., 38-42.

⁴ S. Luke viii., 1-2.

⁵ S. John xi., 1-3.

⁶ S. John xii., 1-8.

But they said: Not on the festival day, lest perhaps there should be a tumult among the people.

And when Jesus was in Bethania, in the house of Simon the leper,

There came to him a woman having an alabaster-box of precious ointment, and poured it on his head as he was at table.

And the disciples seeing it, had indignation, saying: To what purpose is this waste?

For this might have been sold for much, and given to the poor.

And Jesus knowing it, said to them: Why do you trouble this woman? For she hath wrought a good work upon me.

For the poor you have always with you; but me you have not always.

For she in pouring this ointment upon my body, hath done it for my burial.

Amen I say to you, whosoever this gospel shall be preached in the whole world, that also which she hath done, shall be told for a memory of her.⁷

Now the feast of the pasch, and of the azymes was after two days; and the chief priests and the scribes sought how they might by some wile lay hold on him, and kill him.

But they said: not on the festival day, lest there should be a tumult among the people.

And when he was in Bethania, in the house of Simon the leper, and was at meat, there came a woman having an alabaster box of ointment of precious spike-nard; and breaking the alabaster box, she poured it out upon his head.

Now there were some that had indignation within themselves, and said: Why was this waste of the ointment made?

For this ointment might have been sold for more than three hundred pence, and given to the poor. And they murmured against her.

But Jesus said: Let her alone, why do you molest her? She hath wrought a good work upon me.

For the poor you have always with you: and whensoever you will, you may do them good; but me you have not always.

What she had, she hath done; she is come beforehand to anoint my body for the burial.

Amen, I say to you, whosoever this gospel shall be preached in the whole world, that also which she hath done, shall be told for a memorial of her.⁸

The main question concerns the identity or non-identity of the women here mentioned sometimes anonymously, sometimes under different names. A secondary question, however, and one the solution of which is a necessary preliminary to the solution of the former, is the due chronological arrangement of the various anointings here mentioned. Each of the Evangelists tells us that a woman anointed Our Blessed Lord when He was at table. Were there therefore four, three, two or one anointings? We may begin by classing as one the accounts given by S. Matthew and S. Mark. There is no need of proof of this, for the circumstances are the same both as regards time and place, save only that S. Mark adds the breaking of the box.

The same might be said of the anointing mentioned by S. John in his twelfth chapter, but there are certain definite variations of detail which incline us to think that the fourth Evangelist does not really refer to the same event. The characteristics of the fourth Gospel are familiar. Written some sixty years after Our Lord's Ascension and motived by the errors then prevalent it was yet composed in the light of the Synoptic accounts, and its contents are essentially supplementary to the earlier Gospels already in wide circulation. Bearing this in mind, does it not seem strange that S. John should in the

⁷ S. Matthew xxvi., 1-13.

⁸ S. Mark xiv., 1-9.

eleventh chapter refer to a previous anointing of Our Blessed Lord (of which more anon), and then proceed to give in his next chapter a detailed account of an incident which was already well known from the Synoptists? We can understand his giving at great length the miracle of the feeding of the five thousand—the only miracle to be found in all four Gospels—because it served as a necessary introduction to Our Lord's teaching on the Holy Eucharist; but for this repetition of the story of the anointing there was no occasion. Moreover, though it may be urged that S. Matthew has no particular regard for the chronological order, this can hardly be said of his account of the last days, more especially of the Sacred Passion. When, then, he begins his twenty-sixth chapter with the definite statement: "He said to His disciples: you know that after *two* days shall be the Pasch," and then proceeds to give the incident of the anointing we have no right to say "No, it was earlier," because S. John says: "Jesus therefore six days before the Pasch came to Bethania . . . and they made Him a supper there."⁹ Nor can we retort: "but the six days include the two, and John did not mean that the supper actually took place on that sixth day before the Pasch." We can hardly say this, for S. John immediately after the incident of the anointing adds the story of Christ's entry into Jerusalem from Bethany:

And on the *next day* a great multitude, that was come to the festival day, when they had heard that Jesus was coming to Jerusalem,

Took branches of palm-trees, and went forth to meet him, and cried: Hosanna, blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord, the king of Israel.

Moreover, the variations in the accounts themselves as given respectively by S. Mark and S. Matthew on the one hand, and by S. John on the other, are very striking, especially when we bear in mind the supplementary character of S. John's Gospel. Thus S. Matthew tells us that the woman anointed His head, S. John that she anointed His feet; S. Matthew and S. Mark tell us that the banquet took place in the house of Simon the Leper, while S. John would seem to imply that it took place in the home of Lazarus, for Lazarus as His great friend and the subject of the recent miracle "was one of them that were at table with Him," and Martha, as though in her own house, served them, while Mary, also as though in her own house, anointed His feet, thus doing what Simon His earlier host¹⁰ had failed to do.

In the two earlier Gospels there is no mention of Martha or Lazarus, and we are told instead that "when He was in Bethania in the house of Simon the Leper and was at meat, there came a woman having an alabaster box of ointment. . . ." Surely a very differ-

⁹ S. John xii., 1-2.

¹⁰ S. Luke vii., 44.

ent scene from that described in S. John's Gospel. There we have a family scene in the quiet of that home which Jesus loved so well; here, in S. Matthew and S. Mark we feel rather that we are at a public banquet. We notice, moreover, that S. John omits the prophetic words: "Amen, I say to you, whosoever this Gospel shall be preached in the whole world that also which she hath done shall be told as a memorial of her."

At the same time we must admit that on the point of this distinction between the accounts of the anointing on the eve of Christ's Passion the weight of authority is against us, and S. Augustine in particular is at pains to identify them.¹¹

The question of the identity or non-identity of the anointing described for us by S. Luke with one of the two which immediately preceded Christ's Passion presents far less difficulty.

And he went into the house of the Pharisee and sat down to meat. And behold a woman that was in the city, a sinner, when she knew that he sat at meat in the Pharisee's house brought an alabaster-box of ointment; and standing behind at his feet, she began to wash his feet with her tears, and wiped them with the hairs of her head, and kissed his feet and anointed them with the ointment.¹²

¹² S. Luke vii., 36-37.

Time, place and the details of circumstances in the story itself at once mark off this account as distinct from those we have been considering. S. Luke is an historian; he undertakes "to write . . . in order" and he rarely deserts the chronological sequence of events. In his sixth and seventh chapters he relates a series of events which took place between the harvest-time of the second year of the public ministry,

And it came to pass on the second first sabbath, that as he went through the corn-fields his disciples plucked the ears, and did eat rubbing them in their hands.¹³ and the second circuit of missionary preaching in Galilee.¹⁴ The healing of the man with the withered hand, the choice of the twelve, the Sermon on the Plain, the immediate entrance into Capharnaum,¹⁵ the cure of the centurion's servant, the raising to life of the son of the widow of Naim, all follow in orderly sequence; it is not a collection of miracles or of Divine sayings such as S. Matthew groups together in his ninth and thirteenth chapters. Hence we have no right to argue that the episode of the "woman that was a sinner" is not in its true context of time and place. In other words, there is no reason for holding that it did not take place somewhere in Galilee, Naim if you will, or at Magdala itself, which is not many miles distant, and from which S. Mary Magdalen may have derived her name, and during the second year of the public ministry. The

¹¹ *De Consensu Evangelistarum*, lib. II., cap. clv.

¹³ S. Luke vi., 1.

¹⁴ S. Luke viii., 1.

¹⁵ S. Luke vii., 1.

anointing mentioned by the other Evangelists took place in Bethany and at the end of Our Lord's life.

So far, then, we have certainly two, and possibly three, distinct anointings of Our Lord by a woman who in three of the accounts is anonymous, but who is called by S. John "Mary." Two accounts if we class together those given by S. Matthew, S. Mark and S. John; three if we distinguish that of S. John both from that of S. Luke and from those of S. Matthew and S. Mark.

WERE THERE THREE MARYS?

We are now in a position to discuss the main question at issue, namely, whether we are to see one hand or many in this act of love and reverence; whether, that is, we are to carefully distinguish "the sinner" of S. Luke, the unnamed woman of S. Matthew and S. Mark, and the "Mary" of S. John, or whether we are to identify them as one and the same person. We shall have to ask then:

1. Was Mary of Bethany identical with the "sinner" of S. Luke?
2. Was Mary of Bethany also "Mary who is called Magdalen?"
3. Have we, even independently of the two preceding questions, any grounds for saying that: "Mary who is called Magdalen" was the "sinner" of S. Luke?

But we must devote a little space to the Patristic testimony upon the question.

It is commonly affirmed that the Greek and Latin Fathers form two different camps on this point. The Greek Fathers are said to hold the non-identity of these women, while the Latin Fathers as a rule hold that they are one and the same person. The best conspectus of the Patristic evidence on the subject is to be gained from S. Thomas' "Catena Aurea." When commenting on S. Matthew xxvi., 6-13, he gives the following citations from the Fathers:

"Origen: Some one may perhaps think that there are four different women of whom the Evangelists have written, but I rather agree with those who think that there are only three; one, of whom Matthew and Mark wrote, one, of whom Luke, another, of whom John.

"S. Jerome: For let no one think that she who anointed His head and she who anointed His feet were one and the same, for the latter washed His feet with her tears, and wiped them with her hair, and is plainly said to have been a harlot. But of this woman (i. e., in S. Matthew xxvi.) nothing of this kind is recorded, and indeed a harlot could not have at once been made worthy of Our Lord's head.

"S. Ambrose: It is possible, therefore, that they were different persons, and so all appearance of contradiction between the Evange-

lists is removed. Or it is possible that it was the same woman at two different times and two different stages of desert, first while a sinner, afterwards more advanced.¹⁶

"*S. Chrysostom*: And in this way it may be the same in all three Evangelists, Matthew, Mark, and Luke. And not without reason does the Evangelists (S. Matthew and S. Mark) mention Simon's leprosy, to shew what gave this woman confidence to come to Christ. The leprosy was an unclean disease; when, then, she saw that Jesus had healed the man with whom He now lodged, she trusted that He could also cleanse the uncleanness of her soul; and so whereas other women came to Christ to be healed in their bodies, she came only for the honour and healing of her soul, having nothing diseased in her body; and for this she is worthy of our highest admiration. But she in John is a different woman, the wonderful sister of Lazarus.¹⁷

"*Origen*: Matthew and Mark relate that this was done in the house of Simon the Leper; but John says that Jesus came to a house where Lazarus was, and that not Simon, but Mary and Martha served. Further, according to John, six days before the Passover, He came to Bethany, where Mary and Martha made Him a supper. But here (in S. Matthew and S. Mark) it is in the house of Simon the Leper, and two days before the Pasch. And in Matthew and Mark it is the disciples who have indignation with a good intent; in John, Judas alone with intent to steal; in Luke no one finds fault.

"*S. Gregory the Great*: Or we may think that this is the same woman whom Luke calls a sinner and John names Mary.¹⁸

"*S. Augustine*: Though the action described in Luke is the same as that described here, and the name of him with whom the Lord supped is the same, for Luke also names Simon; yet because it is not contrary to either nature or custom for two men to bear the same name, it is more probable that this was another Simon, not the leper, in whose house in Bethany these things were done. I would only suppose that the woman who on that occasion came near to Jesus' feet, and this woman (in S. Matthew xxvi.) were not two different persons, but that the same Mary did this twice. The first is that narrated by S. Luke; for S. John mentions it in praise of Mary before Christ's coming to Bethany: 'And Mary was she that anointed the Lord with ointment and wiped His feet with her hair, whose brother Lazarus was sick.'¹⁹ Mary therefore had done this before. What she did afterwards in Bethany is distinct from

¹⁶ S. Ambrose in Lucae vii., 37.

¹⁷ S. Chrysos., Hom. lxxx.

¹⁸ S. Gregory, Hom. in Evang. xxxiii.

¹⁹ S. John xi., 1.

Luke's account, but is the same event that is recorded by all three, John, Matthew and Mark.²⁰

Theophylact: But although the four Evangelists record the anointing by a woman, there were two women and not one; one described by John, the sister of Lazarus; it was she who six days before the Passover anointed the feet of Jesus; another described by the other three Evangelists. Nay, if you examine, you will find three; for one is described by John, another by Luke, a third by the other two. For that one described by Luke is said to have been a sinner, and to have come to Jesus during the time of His preaching; but this other described by Matthew and Mark is said to have come at the time of His Passion, nor did she confess that she had been a sinner.²¹

S. Augustine: I, however, think that nothing else can be meant but that the sinner who then came to the feet of Jesus was no other than the same Mary who did so twice; once as Luke relates it, when coming for the first time with humility and tears she merited the remission of her sins. . . . But what she did again at Bethany is another act unrecorded by Luke, but mentioned in the same way by the other three Evangelists.²²²³

These quotations will suffice to show the varying views which the Fathers have held on the subject, and they serve, moreover, to show us their various modes of exegesis.

But now let us take the Gospel narratives as they stand and see for ourselves what conclusion they point to. And first of all let us examine the Gospels to see whether Mary of Bethany, the sister of Lazarus, was the sinner mentioned in S. Luke vii., 37.

If we bear in mind the supplementary character of S. John's Gospel we cannot fail to be struck by the passing note of identification:

Now there was a certain man sick, named Lazarus, of Bethania, of the town of Mary and of Martha her sister.

(And Mary was she that anointed the Lord with ointment, and wiped his feet with her hair: whose brother Lazarus was sick.)²⁴

To what anointing does this refer? Evidently one well known to his readers. Can it by an anomaly unparalleled in the Gospels refer to the anointing which S. John is *going* to describe in the next chapter? This would seem impossible, and yet non-Catholic commentators who for some unknown reason have a holy horror of identifying Mary of Bethany with the "sinner" do not hesitate to

²⁰ S. Aug., De Consensu Evang. li., cap. lxxix.

²¹ Theoph. in Lucae vii.

²² S. Aug., De Consensu Evang., lib. li., cap. lxxix.

²³ Catena Aurea in S. Matth. et S. Marcum. Oxford.

²⁴ S. John xi., 1-2.

uphold such an anomalous anticipation on the part of S. John. Thus we read "Mary is apparently put forward as the person best known from the event mentioned in v. 2, and related in ch. xii."²⁵ Now S. John has many of these parenthetical remarks connecting his subject matter with points well known to his readers, and what is more he is careful to distinguish those which refer to the future from those which refer to the past. Thus vi., 72: "Judas Iscariot . . . the same who *was about to* betray Him." Though the event was past at the time of writing yet S. John was going to give it in detail later on; therefore he refers to it in the future tense; whereas in vii., 50, we find: "Nicodemus said to them (he that came to Him by night)." This referred to the past. If, then, in the passage in dispute S. John is referring by anticipation to the event he is about to describe in the twelfth chapter, he will use the expression, "Who was about to anoint Him," where as a matter of fact we find the past, "who anointed." There is no other well-known anointing then to which the Evangelist could be referring except that in S. Luke vii., "a woman who was in the city, a sinner." And yet what important consequences flow from such an authoritative identification. S. John is talking of Mary of Bethany, and, writing in the light of the Synoptic narrative, knowing therefore that S. Luke had left the sinner nameless, he goes out of his way to clear up a source of obscurity, and on his first mention of Mary the sister of Lazarus adds a note to the effect that she is to be identified with the woman who had previously anointed the Lord's feet. Such an identification, which may be classed as "authentic," i. e., Scripture interpreting Scripture, cannot be met by a mere "the confession of Mary of Bethany with a notorious sinner by Luke, who knows the character of Mary is scarcely credible."²⁶ Nor again is it sufficient to reject the identification by saying: "The chief objection is the irreconcilable difference between Mary of Bethany and the sinner."²⁷ The words quoted above from S. Ambrose are sufficient answer to such difficulties: "It is possible that it was the same woman at two different times and two different stages of desert, first while a sinner, afterwards more advanced."

Nor again we see any difficulty in S. Luke's description of the household at Bethany:

Now it came to pass as they went, that he entered into a certain town; and a certain woman named Martha, received him into her house.

And she had a sister called Mary, who sitting also at the Lord's feet, heard his word.

But Martha was busy about much serving. Who stood and said: Lord, hast thou no care that my sister hath left me alone to serve? speak to her therefore, that she help me.

²⁵ Westcott on S. John xi., 1-2. Speaker's Commentary.

²⁶ International Critical Commentary. Plummer, S. Luke vii., p. 209.

²⁷ Ibid.

And the Lord answering, said to her: Martha, Martha, thou art careful, and art troubled about many things.

But one thing is necessary. Mary hath chosen the best part, which shall not be taken away from her.²⁸

Surely there is such a thing as forgiven sin, and what more fitting attitude for the forgiven sinner could be suggested than that here portrayed? This incident is indeed the Divine fulfilment of the Divine promise:

Come to me, all you that labour, and are burdened, and I will refresh you.

Take up my yoke upon you, and learn of me, because I am meek, and humble of heart: and you shall find rest to your souls.

For my yoke is sweet and my burden light.²⁹

It has, however, been urged with some show of reason that Mary must have been above suspicion, for S. John tells us that "many of the Jews were come to Martha and Mary to comfort them concerning their brother," a thing which they would not have done if Mary were the "woman that was in the city a sinner." And in conjunction with this it is urged that whereas Mary came from Bethany, the "sinner" came from Galilee. The second objection supplies the answer to the first; it is precisely because Bethany had not been the scene of her evil courses, but far off Galilee, that Mary had been received amongst the Jews and not scorned as the Pharisee scorned her in Galilee. And an examination of the Greek text of S. John xi., 1, shows us that such a change of residence on the part of the family of Bethany as is here implied is really signified by the Evangelist. We should be inclined to render the passage: "Now there was a certain man sick named Lazarus, who came from Bethany (i. e., was dwelling there at the moment), but was sprung from the village of Mary and Martha," thus implying that he was now sojourning in Bethany, he and his sisters had once lived elsewhere, but had changed their residence.³⁰

If we may now consider Mary of Bethany identical with the "sinner" of S. Luke, can we find in the Gospel any hint that Mary of Bethany was S. Mary Magdalen? We have learned from S. John that it was Mary of Bethany who anointed Our Lord six days before the Pasch, and there is no reason to suppose that S. Matthew and S. Mark, though they mention no name, refer to any one else in their account of the anointing which took place two days before the Pasch, especially if we agree to consider these three accounts as all referring to one event, as most commentators do.

Now, of that woman who S. John tells us was Mary of Bethany, Our Lord said: "Let her alone that she may keep it against the

²⁸ S. Luke x., 38-42.

²⁹ S. Matth. xi., 28-30.

³⁰ Westcott, "Speaker's Comment. on S. John," agrees with this rendering of the Greek text.

day of My burial;"³¹ and of S. Mary Magdalen we read: "Mary Magdalen, and Mary of James, and Salome, brought sweet spices, that coming they might anoint Jesus."³² May we not agree to see in the second passage the literal application of the first? And how pointless the answer of Our Lord reads unless it be read in the light of the second!

Again, of that same woman it was said: "Amen I say to you, whosoever this gospel shall be preached in the whole world, that also which she hath done shall be told for a memorial of her."³³ The Divine prophecy must needs have been fulfilled, and it would almost seem as if S. John had this thought in his mind when he went out of the way to tell us who that woman was, namely, Mary the sister of Lazarus, and she who had some time previously won the pardon of a life of sin by tearfully anointing her Saviour's feet in Galilee, as told us by S. Luke. If the prophecy was to be fulfilled we must know who she was, and S. John has provided for that, and how has the Church and history understood him? By identifying S. John's "Mary of Bethany" with S. Mary Magdalen, "out of whom seven devils were gone forth." But does the Gospel anywhere hint that Mary Magdalen was the "sinner" mentioned by S. Luke?

Before discussing this point it may be as well to draw attention to another passage in S. Luke. In his account of Our Lord's call of S. Matthew we read:

And after these things he went forth, and saw a publican named Levi, sitting at the receipt of custom, and he said to him: Follow me.

And leaving all things, he rose up and followed him.

And Levi made him a great feast in his own house; and there was a great company of publicans, and of others, that were at table with them.³⁴

Contrast this with S. Matthew's own account of his conversion:

And when Jesus passed on from thence, he saw a man sitting in the custom-house, named Matthew; and he saith to him: Follow me. And he rose up and followed him.³⁵

If we were examining some classic work by a pagan author we should be ready enough to recognize the extreme delicacy with which S. Luke veils S. Matthew's identity, and the equal humility with which the quondam publican openly avows the nature of his former avocation. The historian Natalis Alexander drew attention to this point and dwelt upon it as illustrative of S. Luke's character.

Let us now put side by side two other passages from S. Luke:

And behold a woman that was in the city, a sinner, when she knew that he sat at meat in the Pharisee's house, brought an alahaster-box of ointment;

And standing behind at his feet, she began to wash his feet with tears, and

³¹ S. John xii., 7.

³² S. Mark xvi., 1.

³³ S. Mark xiv., 9.

³⁴ S. Luke v., 27-29.

³⁵ S. Matth. ix., 9.

wiped them with the hairs of her head, and kissed his feet, and anointed them with the ointment.

And the Pharisee, who had invited him, seeing it, spoke within himself, saying: This man, if he were a prophet, would know surely who and what manner of woman this is that toucheth him, that she is a sinner.

And (Jesus) turning to the woman, he said unto Simon: Dost thou see this woman? I entered into thy house, thou gavest me no water for my feet; but she with tears hath washed my feet, and with her hairs hath wiped them.

Thou gavest me no kiss; but she, since she came in, hath not ceased to kiss my feet.

My head with oil thou didst not anoint; but she with ointment hath anointed my feet.

Wherefore I say unto thee: Many sins are forgiven her, because she hath loved much. But to whom less is forgiven, he loveth less.

And he said to her: Thy sins are forgiven thee.

And they that sat at meat with him began to say within themselves: Who is this that forgiveth sins also?

And he said to the woman: Thy faith hath made thee safe, go in peace.³⁶

Immediately upon which follows: "And it came to pass afterwards that He travelled through the cities and towns preaching and evangelizing the kingdom of God; and the twelve with Him; and certain women who had been healed of evil spirits and infirmities, *Mary who is called Magdalen*, out of whom seven devils were gone forth."³⁷

Is it too much to say that this is a veiled identification of Mary with the sinner just mentioned? Add to this that Magdala was a town not far from Naim where the incident immediately preceding the conversion of the sinner took place. May not Our Blessed Lord have passed from Naim to Magdala where perhaps Mary was leading her sinful life and whence she probably derived her name? Venerable Bede considers Magdala to have been the scene of her conversion, and two Greek travelers are quoted as having seen in Magdala the house wherein the "Magdalen's" sins were forgiven.

It is easy to urge that Mary Magdalen, who was possessed by seven devils, can hardly have led the life commonly attributed to the "sinner," but surely it is equally easy to retort that this possession may well be a metaphorical expression for the evil passions which held her in bondage.

Again, it should be noticed that S. Luke's introduction of Mary Magdalen is, in his eyes, saved from all note of abruptness by the remark, "Out of whom seven devils were gone forth." This was to identify her, even though in a veiled manner. Up to now he has not mentioned her by name, but he has spoken of her; on the contrary, he has not spoken of Joanna, and therefore he tells us who she was, "the wife of Herod's steward."

To sum up, then, we have endeavored to show from the Gospels themselves, independently of any tradition, the truth of that tradition which the Church cherishes, that tradition which runs through

³⁶ St. Luke vii., 37-50.

³⁷ S. Luke viii., 1-2.

every line of the Breviary Office for the Feast of S. Mary Magdalen, which makes the quondam "sinner" the gentle Mary of Bethany, and finally the "Apostle of the Apostles" after the Resurrection.

Mary of Bethany, the sister of Lazarus, was the "sinner" mentioned by S. Luke, for S. John identifies them for us. Mary of Bethany was also Mary who is called Magdalen, for it is only such an identification that can explain the Divine words: "Let her alone, that she may keep it against the day of My burial,"²⁸ and "Whosoever this Gospel shall be preached in the whole world, that also which she hath done shall be told for a memorial to her."²⁹

And, lastly, the "sinner" was "Mary who is called Magdalen, out of whom seven devils were gone forth," and S. Luke's charity has skilfully veiled the identification.

A very brief history of S. Mary Magdalen, drawn only from the Gospel story, will help to make our view clearer.

In the second year of Our Lord's ministry, when He was in Galilee, he passed through the village of Naim, and there at the gate he revived the widow's only son to life, passing from thence to Magdala, as is at least probable, he dined with the Pharisee and called the "sinner" Mary, the sister of Lazarus, to a better way of life. Thus S. Luke in his seventh chapter. In his next chapter he tells us of the women who supported Our Lord out of their substance, and amongst them he enumerates "Mary who is called Magdalen," this as we have seen reason to suppose being derived from the scene of her disorderly life; He who "came not to call the just but sinners," and who rejoiced to be called "the Friend of . . . sinners" graciously permitted her to follow Him and minister to Him. After a while she returns to her brother and sister and they take up their residence at Bethany, where Jesus comes to visit them, "and Mary sat at His feet" and heard the words of the Divine Consoler: "Mary hath chosen the best part which shall not be taken away from her."

A year and more passes and the time of the S. Passion draws nigh. Jesus comes to Jerusalem and raises Lazarus from the dead. Again, six days before the Pasch, He comes to Bethany, and they make Him a feast in the house of Lazarus, and Martha waits upon them. Then Mary, mindful of a former occasion, anoints His feet and wipes them with her hair. Again, two days before the Pasch, He is entertained at supper by Simon the Leper, and again "a certain woman," whom we hold to be Mary the sister of Lazarus, who had anointed Him but four days before, and the same with the

²⁸ S. John xii., 7.

²⁹ S. Mark xiv., 9.

"sinner" who had come trembling to His feet more than a year ago, comes in, and with a livelier confidence she now not only anoints His feet but His head, and as S. Mark tells us, she broke the vase that none of the precious ointment might fail of its purpose.

Lastly, she "to whom many sins had been forgiven because she loved much," and who had "done this for His burial," completes her repentance (surpassing all the Apostles in her love and devotion) by that three hours' watch at the foot of the Cross, and by her many visits to the tomb wherein she had seen Him laid. Her love and her constancy were fitly rewarded for (first after His Blessed Mother) she merited to behold her Risen Lord.

HUGH POPE, O. P.

Rugeley, England.

DES CARTES AND THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

AMONG the early acts of the Constituent Assembly was a resolution in the nature of a decree declaring that its presence was the realization of Des Cartes' philosophical principles. Doubtless a year or two later the men there would, in their fine Roman manner, vote that he deserved well of the Republic. The Revolution did not begin with the Republic, it began with the overthrow of the orders of the clergy and nobility. It is not ended yet. If any one doubts that the Revolution is still alive, that the volcano is still burning, that the conflict is still being waged between the elements of security and order and the forces of anarchy, the utterances of M. Combes and his predecessor should have put an end to the doubt. We declare, as these men themselves have declared, that they are revolutionists vested with authority, enemies of law clothed with the powers of the state. Proscription is not a policy of settled government. When M. M. Combes and Waldeck Rousseau deprived certain of the religious orders of individual and corporate rights, they attacked the wide interests represented by members of the orders. They say they have suppressed these bodies in accordance with the principles of 1789. This is hardly sufficient; they mean the principles of the Revolution, the principles of public robbery, wholesale proscription, and if practicable, wholesale massacre entered into in 1879. In attacking the religious orders, they invaded the religious and moral rights of every man, woman and child in the State. To suppress a religious order is not

the same thing as to dissolve a fraudulent commercial enterprise. No, and what is more, these men would not dissolve a swindling company as long as its promoters bribed them. The confiscation of the goods and estates of the religious orders may supply the means of filling up the deficit in the Treasury.

In a letter dated from Frohsdorf, in 1872, Henry V. declares that the legislation then about being inaugurated against the parent's right to determine the teaching he desired for his children, was one of the signs that his country was rushing "to the abyss." The person to whom he wrote the letter was one of those Catholic gentlemen still to be found in France, and who in their lives and principles maintain the traditions which made her emphatically "the great nation." They are men to be feared and hated by the base and unscrupulous; and it is against such men in reality that the paltry rabble of legislators enact disabilities when they proscribe religious orders. Monks and nuns are in themselves nothing; they can bear penalties with resignation or welcome them with enthusiasm, but it is the awful rights of God over His people that are taken away when the monk and the nun are imprisoned or banished or degraded from their character as religious. France is back to the eighteenth century when the *philosophe* said with the fool: there is no God.

Every act of the Revolution from its birth was an attack on interests and rights. The first movement in the States General, in 1879, was a lawless rising of the *Tiers Etat* against the other orders and the King. They represented twenty-five millions, they said, the other orders only represented the clergy and nobility. This view is commonly accepted as their justification. It is not true. The clergy from their office had the deepest interest in the material welfare of the people. Men charged with religious and moral responsibilities with regard to every individual life cannot divest themselves of a concern for whatever affects that life. The priest is not only the teacher and director in the highest interests, he is the sympathizing friend in all other interests. Had the parish priest of the eighteenth century in a life devoted to his people from the cradle to the grave, who watched over each one and spent himself for each one, less regard for the comfort of his people than M. La Mettrie, whose philosophical principles were the reflex of his abominable life? than Helvetius, who, in his practice and in his precept, was one of the thousand whom our Burke included in his scornful classification of sophists, economists and calculators, and with all of whom the object of social intercourse was to realize the atrocious sentiment—"Il n'y a de bon dans d'amour que la physiqúe?" So far for the clergy.

Had the middle class no powers in the state? Remember, the

Tiers Etat was elected from the middle class, merchants of the great towns, wealthy shopkeepers and tradesmen of the other towns, lawyers in troops, doctors of medicine, writers; and remember, that all of them, tradesman or publicist, loved virtue with his lips and posed as a *philosophe* each according to his degree. Not one of them but could give to the other proofs of equality, like the barber who piaffed his remonstrance to a supercilious customer: "Sir, I may be only a miserable barber, but I would have you know that I have no more belief in God than the best of you."

Now, from immemorial time, certainly from the eighth century, the middle class exercised in the Communes functions identical with those conferred on county councils and urban councils in England some dozen years ago. Their grievances were nothing more than the effects of a jealousy we allow to be natural. At the same time, in the towns and villages even, there were persons reckoned of this class who could claim any privileges of the nobility, despite their unpatrician birth. This was the sore that rankled. A manufacturer with rights of compelling labor in virtue of some land his grandfather had purchased from an out-at-elbows owner, with the privilege of prefixing "de" to his name, and so on, withered under the blank stare of a seigneur as poor as Job and as badly mounted as Don Quixote.

When the National Assembly, calling itself the Constituent Assembly, after usurping the powers of the other orders, set about business, they decreed their homage to Des Cartes. With all his anxiety to work for his people they made the poor King a roi fainéant. This is not all. The latest canard about the princes who had crossed the frontier and the other émigrés caused a deputation to be sent him. One need not be sentimental to feel for the outraged majesty of the King, to think with our Burke that ten thousand swords should have leaped from their scabbards at the sight of the Queen's tears of humiliation for the husband that she loved. The slightest thing caused a furious debate, mouthing orators threatening this, that and the other, if some one spoke of the Pope's disapproval of the robbery of the church and the releasing of priests and religious from their vows; or said that Monsieur intended going to Vienna, or the Count De Artois was stirring up intrigues at Turin, or that the sovereigns agreed that the King was a prisoner. Having discussed alternatives to their satisfaction—such as suspension of powers, deposition, trial for the newly enacted crime of treason against the nation—at this stage—they would send another message to the King, headed by "*the virtuous Bailly*" perhaps, and consisting of a hundred *virtuous* men besides; later on embassies to the King became warnings to "the hereditary representative." Yet

this legislative anarchy decreed the apotheosis of Des Cartes. They sat in their own estimation as the triumph of his principles, they were the vital expression and embodiment of that intellectual liberty he proclaimed, the visible sign of the power of truth to subdue those who would put fetters on the mind.

All this was, of course, madness and dreaming. They were a confusion of primordial units—unlike the atoms revolving in the vortices of Des Cartes, for these obeyed laws in their path or their aberrations, but units flung from the hand of a maleficent power as elements of everlasting anarchy. Or, if you like, with the State and the church prostrate round them, they resembled Bedouins among the broken arches and the fallen columns of a desert city watching for the caravan they were to attack. If Des Cartes could have come to the scene and could hear the orating and perorating about him, if he could see the fat waistcoats of the Plain filled with emotion and its eyes melting into its six hundred pocket handkerchiefs, if he could gaze on the stern virtue of the Left and the sterner virtue of the extreme Left, Romans all, he would conclude that the daemon who had troubled his studies in life, now stronger in his death, was moving the madmen there to enfold him with the robe of derision and crown him with the diadem of a fool.

There was a method in their madness for all that we have been saying, they could have put Voltaire in the place of honor if they had any regard for consistency. No one had a better title to their worship than the man in whom their own vices had attained a magnitude almost preternatural, whose principles possessed a comprehensive development to which their own great, but still limited baseness could not reach. He had philosophized mendacity into the principle of conduct—they could observe this precept to the letter. His ordinary acts proceeded from a congenital and vehement malignity. The three acts of his long life that appear to have been dictated by a spirit of justice were inspired by hatred of the laws and the men that administered them. He was keen to take advantage of accidental defects in institutions, when the doing so would serve the cause of disorder. In his old age he writes to his niece to procure for the decoration of Ferney the most obscene pictures she could find. His detestation of whatever was worthy of reverence, his scorn of all that had a place in the heart from the associations of virtue, the example of good men and women, the influences of the home of childhood, point him out as the tutelary deity of a legislature whose business was the resolution of the moral elements of the world to chaos. In their own writings the *philosophes* of the Assembly, as their predecessors had done, held up chastity as a sin against nature, the self-denial of Christianity as the offering of

ignorance to superstition, self-effacement, self-sacrifice for the benefit of others as a blasphemy against reason. In these conclusions of intellectual animalism Voltaire was their model and ought to have been consecrated as the object of their adoration.

Or, it may have been, that the apotheosis of Des Cartes had its origin in that felicitous irony of mental processes with which experts in the psychosis of insanity are familiar. The madman who suspects the doctor has come to examine him displays a coherence of thought, a clearness of statement, a plausibility in accounting for acts needing explanation that baffles the judgment. On some such principle we may understand the policy which guided this collective wisdom in dedicating themselves to the genius of philosophy in the person of Des Cartes. He was a Catholic, and though his intellectual dominion had gone down before the advance of English materialism in philosophy, the qualified atheism of the Deist in religion, the revolutionary liberalism of the Whig in politics, it could not be altogether forgotten that for a time his metaphysical and natural science was supreme in the whole world of thought, and therefore, they resolved under the appearance of homage to decree him infamous.

They were fond of classical models, they were instinct with the humanism that fell on France in the reign of Amurath, commonly called Francis I., as an enervating influence on the mind, as a passionate incitement to the heart. They knew that the Greeks and Romans dedicated shrines and temples to the infernal powers, to the fates that are inexorable, to the deities that preside over the offices of hate and revenge and lawless love, to theft and to the clerkliness that provides documentary evidence for the false friend, the grasping relative, the fraudulent trustee: so the Constituent Assembly in erecting its altar may have hoped to gratify the worshipers of Voltaire and Rousseau, d'Holbach and d'Alembert, Condorcet, Diderot, and all the other Gods of the revolutionary pantheon by sealing with the ignominy of its reverence, the great intellect that had in spite of speculative mistakes been always faithful to the Church.

This is no fanciful idea of ours. Not one particle of influence was possessed by Des Cartes' ideas during the eighteenth century. The sensationalism of Bacon, Hobbes and Locke was the *fons et origo* of every speculation on morals, on laws and society whether the thinker like Codillac says everything, even instinct, is acquired, or like Cabanis that thought is a secretion of the brain, or like Condorcet and d'Alembert that religion is the power that opposes the progress of mankind. It is the very industry of a malice which finds in Des Cartes' initial rule of evidence the source of eighteenth cen-

ture philosophy and the cataclysm to which that philosophy so much contributed.

The initial principle of the Cartesian system may be taken, if you like, as a challenge to authority, but it must be limited by Des Cartes' own words and by his own application of the method. Nothing is to be accepted on authority alone, even if backed by the name of Aristotle. This is his dictum. English philosophers at once cry out that he is the Luther of philosophy, that he is full of the spirit of the Renaissance and the Reformation, that he is above all others animated by the ideas and energies of those movements and that in a more decided sense than Bacon he is the leader of modern thought. We at once concede his immeasurable superiority to Bacon. We see in this no impeachment of St. Thomas' philosophy. So far as this was a vehicle of theological definition and deduction there could be no conceivable attack upon it in the dictum cited; for Des Cartes in the most express terms excluded theological questions and necessarily the philosophy linked to speculation about such questions from the application of the rule. He knew that on the data supplied by Revelation the deepest problems affecting man's destiny had been thought over with a severity of reasoning, a penetration of analysis, a rapid perception of relations and a formative power not equaled in the Academy, or the Portico, or any ancient school. The only man among the ancients who could have single-handed attempted the construction of such a science as theology had become was Aristotle. The man that resembled him most among the schoolmen was St. Thomas certainly, but there had been and there were great doctors and great thinkers in every part of Europe constantly adding to the fabric. Before St. Thomas' time the whole range of human knowledge had been classified; and the coördination of science we are presented with by Bacon in the *De Argumentis* was in conformity with the arrangement in the schools.

The influence of Aristotle had been swept away, except in the Protestant theological seminaries which still in Des Cartes' time followed Aristotle in natural science, in metaphysical and in moral science. Investigation in natural science in Catholic seminaries and universities had been sapping the conclusions drawn from the physics of Aristotle ever since Roger Bacon's tremendous philippic in the *Compendium Studii Philosophiæ* published in 1271. It is very well worth noticing that the Friar Bacon has anticipated in the *Opus Tertium* his Elizabethan namesake in much that is valuable in the latter's views of experimental science and that he gives an investigation into the nature and cause of the rainbow which is described as a fine example of inductive research. But as to Francis Bacon's

inductive method it could only be employed when the investigator was already in full possession of the facts and the laws to be discovered.¹

This is the clear force of the dependence of the *Organum* on a complete natural history for its utility. We are entitled to say that when Des Cartes rejected the authority of Aristotle, he did so only with regard to physics; or, at least, that he did not mean to question the authority of St. Thomas with regard to metaphysical problems or even the testimony of introspection concerning the operations of the mind. It may be objected that his psychology is essentially different from St. Thomas'. We submit that the difference is accidental rather than essential. He did not suppose that cerebration was the cause of thought, but was the concomitant of thought. It may be that he was an idealist in the modern sense, but we shall defer this question until we come to deal with one or two metaphysical problems around which the principal controversy on his philosophy has centred.

Besides this misinterpreted challenge to authority on which the Constituent Assembly may have based its homage, the pretensions of persons calling themselves disciples of Des Cartes to have acted on his principles may have afforded additional appearance of warrant for the resolution. Montesquieu ostentatiously professed to follow him in the domain of political philosophy; and he did so by applying the method of geometry to speculations on society. As a philosophic tract *L'Esprit des Lois* is of little value; as an instance of the futility of employing the wrong method in a department of research it is invaluable. The postulate at the head of his speculations is that man is the creator of society. In this he was followed by the whole tribe of *philosophes*, and the result is the chaos that still prevails.

With Des Cartes, God is the source of all moral and material existences; not as an initial force but a creative intelligence and power; not by the starting of germinal elements, but by the perfect creation of everything one by one, from suns to the creatures whose universe is a drop of water. We fancy our readers will think we are writing under the influence of a lying spirit, that we are driving back Des Cartes to the principles of the Monastery school for the coloni, lidi and slaves of a rural circonscription in the sixth century, that we are forgetting his theory of vortices which roused to madness the Lutheran divines and professors in Holland.

All this, however, shall be presented before we are done. Admitting, in all the fullness claimed by the most advanced admirers of

¹ It is very remarkable that Roger Bacon in what he calls "*offendicula*" has anticipated the later Bacon's doctrine of the *Idola*.

Des Cartes in the present day, that his theory of the universe is so much a result of mechanical force as not to need the agency of a Creator to explain the phenomena of figure and motion, admitting that when he reached his irreducible point of extension as the essential difference of matter, admitting that he did so to take shelter in a dualism in conflict with his principles: still we say that he only intended this as a method of instruction and that he constantly appeals to God as the Creator of all things and of every single thing. Not an organism but has come from His hands in the beginning. Now if society be an organism it must on Des Cartes' own principles have come from God. He speaks of the "blundering humours" of those who seek change for the sake of change, he expresses supreme contempt for what we call political and social reformers who are perpetually in the search of novelties not from a sense of their necessity but because they are new. We doubt very much could a better estimate of the *philosophes* of the century of Revolution be found. We doubt whether the *philosophes* in the Constituent Assembly could be more happily described; we shrewdly suspect that those virtuous men knew of the opinion and accordingly that like Voltaire they must have hated him in their souls.

Even at the risk of wearying our readers we must add that in the mental and moral world Des Cartes has God so prominently in view that He is always present. He is not merely Author of the intellectual and moral world but its Guardian over every process of thought and dictate of conscience. So much is this the case that Malebranche draws from it his beautiful but somewhat dangerous philosophy of the "Vision of God." Spinoza draws from it the illimitable expansion, the fathomless depth of uncreated Being of which the countless seeming shapes that fill the universe are modes. Society then as a moral entity must have proceeded from God on Cartesian principles.

All the young men in the National Assembly, even the greater part of the young nobles, were badly tainted by the stupidities of Rousseau which were called beautiful sentiments and the sarcasms of Voltaire which were regarded as the criticisms of a powerful and penetrating mind. Belonging to the *Tiers Etat* were many Bourgeois of that type made immortal as the "*Gentilhomme*" more than a hundred years before by Molière. These were more under the dominion of Rousseau's sentiments even than of the destructive criticisms of Voltaire. In 1789 the air was vibrating with sound and movement. The bourgeoisie wanted change; they were philosophical and virtuous and like Cæsar were ambitious.

Some idea of needs and their appeasement had passed into the minds of the peasantry as a spirit may enter into the adamant of the

mountains, as the spoken thought may echo amid the savage rocks ; so they felt in almost inarticulate ways that the good King in calling the Estates would give them food, take off the siegneur's chains of labor, remove the nation's load of taxes from their backs. In such ways the seeds called ideas sometimes germinate and the ambition of the bourgeoisie knew how to make them grow portentously in the peasants' slowly receptive minds.

Those *philosophes* of court and town and village could trade on sad and awful memories too. There is a sympathy of passionate feeling which may be roused by declamation when memories coalesce with experiences. We are not heedless of the grievances of the people. We say that the Revolution was brought about, at least in part, by men who had no grievances of their own but who were fired by jealousy and ambition. These used the poor peasants' vague sense of something out of joint to madden them with the idea that they were wronged. There was not a shade of oppression on account of religion at the time, yet the declaimers led the South to believe that they were back to the dragonnades,² that it was one and the same power devoured the peasants' substance, and sent the horseman to scatter the prayer meetings of the Huguenots. So the Catholic peasants were fired against a religious persecution that was imaginary, fired to break the chains of persons freer than themselves.

In fact there were comparatively few Huguenots at all and hardly any of them were peasants. The lower classes of them were village tradesmen or tradesmen in the larger towns, and so well was the pretence of the cruelty of their wrongs agitated in commune and commune, parish and parish, that a proportion was sent to the States General greatly in excess of what their numbers and stake in the country warranted. Nor is the motive of this far to seek. The bourgeois' who ought to have been Catholics had become atheists. Political and social ambition was their passion. They knew that the Huguenot deputies would be irreconcilable and therefore invaluable in the conflict to be provoked against the clergy and nobility. It was no regard for religious liberty that moved them ; or if it were any such principle, it was the liberty that suppressed the Jesuits, that was about to suppress all the religious orders, that was about to send priests in shoals to the prisons, to hang priests from the lamp-posts and hunt them like wild beasts, to offer them as hecatombs under the guillotine to the goddess of reason and the ideas called liberty, fraternity, equality, that was about to shut up the Churches and cut

² Louis XIV. was a Gallican, not a Catholic. The Huguenots have no ground to quarrel with Catholics, but Catholics were wronged by them.

off the heads of men and women suspected, or accused of desiring to follow the religion in which they had been born.

The only grievances existing in France were on certain badly managed estates. The resident landlords were humane and considerate towards their peasants, but their haughtiness to "the intelligent middle class" was an inexcusable crime. On the estates of those nobles who had thronged the purlieus of the Court from the time of Louis XIV. until the time of the Revolution the degradation of the people was beyond description. The relatives of the great man and his *intendant*, ruled the district. These stood between the peasant and the sun, huge figures filling the space between the earth and sky, terrible in their anger, more terrible in the license that would invade the sacred treasures which gave to the poor man's hut the only light in life. These lordlings did what they willed, they are compared to the powers of nature that Kings' armies cannot stay, to the wind and the rain, the frost and snow, the wild lightning, they are compared to fate inevitable, irresistible; and so, upon such estates gaunt poverty walked dull eyed to the grave. Why, so insane was the pride of the great man's relatives, all nobles of course, that the peasants dared not put out manure on their crops lest the game should take a relish not acceptable to lordly palates.

We are not surprised that interested disturbers of the peace would inflame their minds; make them think it was better to rise up and destroy chateaux and out-buildings, terrify and have revenge even though death should find them at the work; than like dumb beasts to live their lives of half-hunger and all hopelessness waiting for the grave.

For what these creatures in their madness might do we have no word but one of pity. If they thought in their unchained anger they "saw" better by hanging priests and nobles from the lamp-posts we say God pity them. Our quarrel is with the smug bourgeois Gentil-homme for whom the Sixth and Seventh Commandments had been repealed, who talked of equality to those creatures and took a fit if any of them touched his coat of "incroyable" cut, whose heart expanded with fraternity for negroes in San Domingo, but never gave a sou to poverty in his district; never gave anything that could be construed into an act of benevolence until when as a deputy of the Constituent he voted other men's money to the Paris rabble to insult the King and Queen and to murder those enemies of the human race, the priest and the aristocrat. It is not with the poor peasants we quarrel, it is with the shameless bourgeois lawyer, doctor, journalist or shopkeeper who spoke of humanity, benevolence and virtue as ideas possessing his most distinguished consideration; and yet could denounce to the tribunal the daughter of some

prisoner who would not buy with her dishonor her father's liberty or life. It is with him in the name of ruined France, of violated justice, of outraged God we quarrel. It is he who has profited by the Revolution, it is he who rules and dishonors France to-day.

None of these philosophical effects could have preceded from the works of Des Cartes; what relation is there between the principles of the *philosophes* and the broken ends of atoms shot from the centre of a vortex and constituting a firmament? Let us test by results. Des Cartes had been put upon the shelf by these gentlemen; but their principles are very definitely expressed in September massacres, the unimaginable horrors of the Comtat-Venaissin approved, if not inspired, by the Girondists, the red carnival of the Paris Terror, the Terror in the provinces when the night skies were illuminated by flaming villages and castles, when the roads looked as though the fierce mercenaries of the days of English invasion had passed from the number of the dead of both sexes of every period of life from infancy to old age.

Let it be understood distinctly that Des Cartes placed religion, the only religion he had in view, his own, on a plane above the meddling of *philosophe* or amateur, assuming that there can be a distinction in the eighteenth century between the words at all. The *philosophe* of that time, when he was not a scarecrow, of the author species such as we have hold of in Gil Blas' dinner was a dapper, petit maitrish kind of thinking man, free of salons and marble halls. He could tell women of fashion as they stood on high-heeled shoes under the snow castles erected by their perruquiers, that morals were matters of convention largely dependent on the meridian for their validity, that society was an exchange of concession as proved in *L'Esprit des Lois* in such an interesting manner by mathematics and the inductive process invented by Milor Bacon. Religion except natural religion, he would say, which every one found in the heart, putting his hand on that region—the heart alas! discovered to be a force-pump by the illustrious Englishman Harvey, religion had ceased to exist, ecclesiastical or ceremonial religion was priestcraft. The church, however, as an institution was excellent as it provided bishoprics and rich abbeys for the younger sons of great families. This twaddle heard in the salons of such ladies, ladies, ladies as the fair d'Epinaï and de Tencin and the charmers of the *Encyclopædia*, could not be regarded as other than sound doctrine in faith and morals. Women who had sons or nephews fit for nothing on earth but to receive the income of rich abbeys or dioceses found this consistent with the Social Contract, that new Gospel of Mme. De Waren's protégé.

Before we conclude this article which is not intended to be an

examination of Des Cartes' philosophy much less of his influence on modern thought, there are one or two points we desire to suggest. We have implied that his principles had no authority on those who are immediately responsible for the Revolution. Their views were taken from the English thinkers of the sensational school, views which in them at least constituted a frank materialism. We do not think all of the *philosophes* were convinced materialists. There were men like Condillac, that man forever on guard against his conscience,³ who took it up as the cult of good society which ever since the Regency had been dancing its minuets of irreverence and immorality until at the end of the Well-beloved's reign there was hardly any man of social position with courage to avow belief in Christianity; hardly a woman so unfashionable as to admit a respect for virtue. Remember, that the men—we care not if they were the descendants of Crusaders—were the lackeys of the King's mistresses, that the women, with few exceptions, had so far forgotten themselves as to pay court to each Vice-Queen as her star arose. There were men like La Mettrie to whom a fat, rank materialism was the adjustment of the intellectual atmosphere to human nature, that is, to appetite, a relation of action and reaction such as we have in that profound *Durivinian* novelty, old as *Plato's Republic* and the *Politics* of Aristotle—which is called the effect of environment. There were men like Condorcet, so religious or conscientious in their apostolate of iniquity that whilst they affected in their published writings a respect for decency in language, a regard for the Christian religion and the moral code it sanctioned, were most industriously disseminating in anonymous pamphlets and in social intercourse principles of conduct so hideous in their grossness, so savage in their lawlessness that one might be excused for thinking it all a satire or burlesque.

Here indeed we have effects of the spirit of the Renaissance, here as in Italy in the last half of the fifteenth century and the first half of the sixteenth, when the spirit of liberty died with the spirit of religion, with chastity, with the spirit of the giving up of all for Christ. The callous insolence and inexpressible viciousness of the Italian scholar and his pupil who was to be one of the tyrants of the land, we have here in France during the century in which the Revolution burst forth, to appal, terrify and yet to vindicate the laws of God to man. When Professor Caird speaks of Des Cartes as being full of the spirit of the Renaissance, he forgets the latter's contempt for what is called scholarship.⁴ To him what are spoken of as "the

³ So de Mailstre speaks of him.

⁴ Des Cartes lost all interest in the Princess Palatine when he heard she was learning Greek.

fair humanities of old religion" would have no meaning, to him the paganism that could see a religion through the hazes of classic imagination, through the lights and shadows of the fancy in the pillars of some Ionic temple by the sea, in the classic groups on the foreground, and in a long procession headed by the garland crowned oxen and the sacrificing priest coming from the twilight of a forest glade into the sunlight of the temple space, to him such fantasy would be the madness of midsummer.

There is no comparison between the war carried on against religion in France and the criticisms of the unbelievers of whom Plato speaks. These are intelligible, but the propagandism of the *philosophe* could only have its inspiration from hell; it was a phase of the war against religion that in one form or another, and with varying degrees of activity had been going on in France for a century and a half before the Revolution. Even the genius of Bossuet could not arrest the ideas of the Libertines on their way; and we strongly suspect that his ominous prediction as to the religious and moral conflicts to arise from Des Cartes' principles sprang from his sense of the use the Libertines might make of them, rather than from any intrinsic evil they possessed. Bossuet and Fenelon both considered that Cartesianism could be reconciled with Christianity, that is to say, that the metaphysics of Des Cartes could be employed as an instrument of Christian thought, as the metaphysical ideas of Plato had been by the Fathers and the mental and moral philosophy of Aristotle by their successors. It would be the merest childishness to think that in a matter of this kind the Eagle of Meaux could be so utterly mistaken as to deem it possible that a philosophy of universal scepticism could be the vehicle of theological explanations and deductions.

This being so we ask: Is the initial rule of evidence the position of a sceptic? If what is stated as its effect be true, knowledge is a dream. But that it is the position of a sceptic we deny even though the charge is advanced by Hume. It is a simple abuse of language to call that a fundamental doubt which was only intended to open the door to certitude. To make a major and a minor the premises of a conclusion materially different from what they contain can only happen by bad reasoning. We propose an illustration of bad logic in the following: Whoever thinks, knowing the mendacity of his faculties, exists according to their testimony, but the faculties are liars when they tell me I exist, therefore I certainly exist. This is substantially the process into which an intuition is broken up in order to bury Des Cartes among the ruins of his system.

The whole philosophical system must be looked at in order to arrive at the meaning of this so-called doubt. We readily admit

that in the history of what he calls his great conception there is something like an impeachment of the veracity of all our sources of information. No one has ever criticized Locke for comparing the mind to a *tabula rasa*—though we decidedly deny that the mind is a blank paper on which automatus long pens called sensations and an automatus short pen called reflexion write hieroglyphics. Then why criticize Des Cartes' initial doubt? Is it fair?

Des Cartes believed in the creation as the belief is stated in the Creeds, believed in it as he was taught to believe when a little child. At the same time he considered himself as offering no disrespect to faith when he presents in an analytical instruction the mode by which we might understand something of the nature and properties of the organic and inorganic universe. "But yet as it is best," he says, having laid down the position of a perfected creation, "as it is best if we are to understand the nature of plants or of men, to consider how they may proceed from seeds, rather than how they were created by God in the beginning of the world, if we can think out some extremely simple principles from which we can prove how the stars and the visible world could have originated—we shall in that way explain their nature better than by describing them as they now exist." The words we omitted from the passage say we know that the things spoken of "were created by God in the beginning of the world." We omitted them as a deflection from the current of the thought, we refer to them to emphasize our opinion of the writer's good faith.

The doubt has been somewhere described as "an hyperbolical" one. This we think a true description, so far as it means a method of calling attention to a fact not the less real that it was usually lost sight of when estimating our mental possessions. It may be regarded also as a method of abstraction by which the items of human knowledge are withdrawn from accidental associations at the time of acquisition or accretions of a later date.

It is true, in the history of the process by which he reached the conclusion that all his previous knowledge should be sifted, he questions the truthfulness of every source of information. It has been objected and forcibly that on such a basis certitude could never rise. Still the question remains, was the impeachment of the faculties genuine? If every source of knowledge is untrustworthy there can be no truth for us. To turn aside for a moment from the initial doubt, let us bear in mind that he asserts the validity of mathematical demonstrations. These rest on certain definitions, but they also rest on certain intuitions called axioms. It may be pointed out that he also doubts the validity of these demonstrations, that the intellect itself under the spell of his daemon has given unveracious testimony

as to the steps in the most simple processes of mathematical reasoning. But this must be taken according to his own version, that as long as he is looking at the process of demonstration he is convinced, he cannot choose but be convinced; it is only when he looks away and remembers, that doubts of the validity of the processes are possible. This proves nothing except, indeed, the hyperbole. Accordingly we have intellectual intuitions that are veracious and processes of inference that are irresistible.

We may now take a comparison. Allowing for what St. Thomas calls the prejudice of mathematicians against the value of the results in any department except their own, yet we have a measure in the contrast Des Cartes raises between the certitude of mathematics and the steps in the moral sciences. In the latter he says we can only attain probability. But that is what everybody says so far as the latter are not confirmed by the sanction of supernatural authority. Yet he makes a curious remark. He says that reason may attain certainty with regard to moral questions when the advancement by investigation in other fields of labor shall have supplied the material. Surely this does not argue a final distrust in the faculties; though it lies open to the objection that it gives reason a power she does not possess; namely, that of drawing conclusions of certitude in a domain in which only probability can be reached.

The doubt he has constituted is a principle of safeguarding. He relies on mathematical deductions, that is, on the faculties that present them. Suppose we transfer to this connection the intuition, *cogito ergo sum*, and analyze it this way. He is conscious of valid operations in mathematics and the certainty of the intuitions from which they primarily proceed. He is the person engaged in these processes, they are his activities, if they are valid he cannot be deceived as to his consciousness of them and of their validity. If he doubts as to their validity he cannot doubt of their existence, but their existence is inseparable from their validity, that is, inseparable from the consciousness of his own existence. As there is an imperfection in this existence, as its power is limited, he is conscious of the limitation, and in this consciousness of the finite he has the intuition of the infinite, that is, of perfection, that is, of God.

The objection then arises: He does not get beyond the mind; How is he to get beyond the mind? How bridge the chasm to the external world? The difficulty lies, we think, not in the so called scepticism of his factitious impeachment of the faculties but in a system which seems more like modern idealism than the direct and immediate knowledge we possess of external nature from the perceptions of sense. How far this proceeds from his metaphysic of the soul is not obvious: for if the soul sees the ideas and makes them

the material of thought it does not seem that the location of the soul in the pineal gland makes any difference as long as it presides over the physical organism as the principle of consciousness and vitality. Mr. Mivart represents him as making it distinct from the life of the body, as simply a spirit the activity of which is thought, as something separate from its case. Though we do not think Dr. Mivart has taken in Des Cartes' view of the relation between the soul and body, there seems no doubt that Des Cartes has not grasped the scholastic idea that the soul is the informing spirit of the body. We wonder at this: for to this conclusion in a remarkable degree the latest physiological research is tending; and Des Cartes' own investigation of nervous activities is admittedly as far to the front as the most recent.⁵ We do not think he at all meant that the soul in the pineal gland sits at the end of a telegraphic apparatus possessing the magic power of setting up the pictures of things abroad. In truth the soul was the animating principle in every part of the body: but what he seems to have wanted was the idea of man as a composite nature. We fear then that the want of this conception must at least unconsciously have made the physical organism stand in his speculation in the place of a medium between the ego which was the soul and external nature. Yet he arrived at the knowledge of external reality, but by a process which has been described in a consensus of disparagement from all quarters as arguing in a circle.⁶

It has been said that his argument for the existence of external reality depends for its validity on the existence of God and this for its validity depends on the veracity of his faculties. These were created by God whom he knows to be infinitely beneficent and just, and who would not curse his creature with the snare of mendacious faculties. He is placed in the midst of a universe by God in which his destiny is to be worked out by the powers conferred by the Creator. He is not a thing apart, there is nothing of the kind in creation, there is a link of dependence between him and the world round him as there is between him and the society of which he is a member. His life here and his life beyond the grave, both depend upon the use he makes of society and the world. A knowledge of both is essential to him, the idea he could be created by a perfect being to walk blindfold through life is in conflict with the laws of thought, though a being less than omnipotent could very well be conceived as sending him forth into the creation so marred and maimed and blasted by that power's malignity as to be unable to attain truth in speculative judgment, to distinguish right from wrong,

⁵ Huxley.

⁶ What is said, in effect, is that he argues in a circle to get beyond his own consciousness.

good from evil in practical judgment. He would be a wandering star the light of which was extinguished, to pass away perhaps from this scene into the universal energy which never can be increased perhaps, never diminished perhaps.

There must be then some means given him of using life, of employing powers that he is conscious of, powers that compel attention to their activities in every waking moment. He has received this means by the power of discerning "clear ideas." Whenever he has a clear idea, that is the possession of truth, for it is the knowledge of the thing itself, truth is the property of a clear idea. The faculties vouched for by God so present it. He has a clear idea of God himself, that is a true idea, he could not have that idea so clear and luminous and overpowering unless it stood for a real existence—in other words—that it was a true idea. The faculties with which God has endowed him tell him this is true, coerce him to recognize this to be true, convince him of this: but as God could not have endowed him with lying faculties, therefore, God exists. This is how critics present him.

How the misconception in all this criticism arose it is hard to understand. As we have said it is not confined to any school; all critics from all parts of the compass join in it. We hope we shall not fall under the sentence of one critic who has, in a most able manual of elementary philosophy, characterized Des Cartes as a man who has developed a colossal conceit.⁷ The usual course of criticism is to separate the condition of veracity for the presentation of the senses, from the philosophy of clear ideas in relation to God. To treat the latter as a conception valid from the clearness of the idea that validity being guaranteed by God.

But the idea of God, as we have already pointed out, is an intuition of the infinite from the finite, the perfect from the imperfect. It is an intuition transcending relation and opposition. Des Cartes even goes the length of saying it is prior to the idea of self-consciousness. This we think inconsistent with his history of it, but still we could say there might be a logical precedence, if not a priority, in time. To the objection that the idea of God must be negative, that of self existence being the positive, he answers that it is the other way. The infinite is the positive, it is where limits are concerned that negation begins, for the infinite contains all within itself, the perfect all within itself: whilst the drawing of boundaries is the negation of the infinite. This might lead to the annihilation of created existences, the transforming them into modes or manifestations of the uncreated but it moves along a different line from the theory of clear ideas; and it is simply a confusion of thought which causes his

⁷ Mill said this of Comte.

critics to describe his conception of God as one derived by the fallacy of arguing in a circle.

Whatever may be said of this purely intellectual realization, the idea of a perfect Creator is one which none of his pretended followers in the eighteenth century have risen to. Voltaire, while inferring from the design evident everywhere, a power that designed, writes such shocking blasphemies about the Lord that we cannot suppose him capable of thinking of a God possessing moral qualities. We could not give these blasphemies to the reader, they are too diabolical even for an age of free-thinking, when the age has a regard for dignity of thought and language. We have this conception of Voltaire's resuscitated by Robespierre in a practical fantasy of sacerdotal imitation, that is to say Robespierre, in swallow-tail blue coat, plays the part of high-priest of Voltaire's Supreme Being and sets fire to a card-board effigy of atheism, amid the cheers of his *sans culottes*. Yet he is said to have displayed the truest grasp of the political situation of any man of the time, not excepting Mirabeau. We have only to say that Mirabeau, incarnate obloquy though he was, possessed the genius of a statesman. He alone in those days of judicial blindness saw that if the state were to stand it should be on the basis of reconciliation with the past, with the memories, traditions, institutions, customs, laws that had been interwoven with the national mind. He believed it possible that forces of reform could be infused into the social system, that a monarchy, broad-based on the peoples' will would enter on a new existence as the guarantee for equal justice and the security for public order. Unfortunate in his atheism and the profligacy of his life, religion and morality could not be served by such unholy and unclean hands. He said in his last breath he bore the monarchy with him: no, it was his sins that had found him and made the great gifts with which he had been endowed a sign, a wonder for their impotence. The reign of anarchy had set in.

It is not intended in this article to ask a place in any curriculum for the philosophy of Des Cartes. Our only object was to point out that a name once great in all the fields of science has been allowed to fall into discredit where he might claim a home. If it be true that a history of modern thought cannot be written without his name being set down as the marking of an epoch it would follow that no system of education can be considered complete which does not recognize the part he took in the development of philosophy. The most recent thinkers of all shades are spoken of in our schools. There is not one who does not admit indebtedness to him in natural science and mathematics. In metaphysics and natural theology men have been led by him towards the safe way in-so-far as these pur-

suits have conducted them to an appreciation of God as personal and of infinite perfection.

We have endeavored to show that he is in no way responsible for the theories advanced in France during the century in which the Revolution began. His idea was to combine in a system the worlds of intellect and external nature as the work of the same creative mind. To find the indecomposable point in the world of intellect, and the indecomposable point in that of matter was the task he set himself with an energy like a Titan's piling mountain upon mountain to the skies. The strength and the simplicity of the conception will always have an interest for the genuine student. Among the ironies in which fate has been fruitful the most singular is the selection of him by the Constituent Assembly as its genius.

To estimate it properly one must summon spirits from "the vasty deep." The ghosts of Danton, Marat, Robespierre, walk before us, their hands dripping with blood. The Girondists emerge from the shadows with the marks of justice on themselves who had done unworthy slaughter upon others. We see the blameless King, we see the Queen in that time of omens, clear of intellect, with faith fixed as the everlasting hills and see both borne to their doom. Amid the blood and horror the great philosopher is called, but not by us, as the spirit that inspired them.

GEORGE McDERMOT, C. S. P.

New York.

THE TWO STABATS.

(II. THE DOLOROSA.)

IN the January issue of the *Review* a comparison was instituted between the Speciosa and the Dolorosa, and some prefatory observations were made on the general character of both hymns. The Speciosa was also considered in detail. In the present paper, therefore, exclusive attention may be given to the incomparably grander hymn, the Dolorosa.

I. AUTHORSHIP.

The hymn has been ascribed to many different possible authors: (a) Innocent III. (*1216), an ascription which Gregorovius declares unfounded. Benedict XIV., in his *De Festis D. N. J. C. et B. V. M.*, gives it without question to Innocent III.: "Auctor fuit magnae doctrinae clarus praestantia Summus Pontifex Innocentius III.," and quotes three authorities. Mone, in his notes on the hymn, and Hurter, in his *Life of the Pope*, give it to the same great Pontiff. The latest writer on the subject, the Rev. J. Mearns, after reviewing the claims of other candidates, ascribes it to Innocent with a (?) and says: "Certainly, Pope Innocent III. had quite sufficient ability to have written such a masterpiece, and the ascription is strengthened by the fact that to him has been attributed, with great probability, another masterpiece of Latin sacred poetry, viz., the *Veni sancte Spiritus Et emitte*." Before this, the Rev. Mr. Duffield had written with much positiveness: "He did not write the *Stabat Mater*, nor did he compose the *Veni sancte*." Following the thought of Mone that the original text comprised in all probability stanzas 1, 4, 3, 5, 9, 10 of the Roman Missal text, Wackernagel prints this cento and ascribes it to Innocent. The cento is reprinted by Kayser, but merely as a convenience for the reader, since there is no manuscript authority for it:

- | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Stabat mater dolorosa | 5. Eia mater, fons amoris, |
| Juxta crucem lacrimosa, | Me sentire vim doloris |
| Dum pendebat filius: | Fac, ut tecum lugeam; |
| Cujus animam gementem, | Fac ut ardeat cor meum |
| Contristantem et dolentem, | In amando Christum Deum |
| Pertransiuit gladius. | Ut sibi complaceam. |

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>4. Pro peccatis suae gentis
Vidit Jesum in tormentis
Et flagellis subditum;
Vidit suum dulcem natum
Moriendo desolatum,
Dum emisit spiritum.</p> | <p>9. Fac me plagis vulnerari
Cruceque me fac beari
Ob amorem filii;
Inflammatum et accensus
Per te, pia, sim defensum
In die iudicii.</p> |
| <p>3. Quis est homo qui non fleret,
Christi matrem si videret
In tanto supplicio?
Quis non posset contristari
Piam matrem contemplari
Dolentem cum filio.</p> | <p>10. Christe, cum sit hinc transire,
Da per matrem me venire
Ad palmam victoriae;
Quando corpus morietur,
Fac ut anima donetur
Paradisi gloriae.</p> |

(b) Jacobus de Benedictis (Giacomo da Todi, known also as Giacomone or Jacopone), the Latinized form of Giacomo de' Benedetti, a Franciscan (*1306). This is the most common ascription, and, at first review of the evidence in its favor, the most probable one. A careful analysis of the evidence, however, is not reassuring. An Italian manuscript of the fifteenth century, entitled: "Incipiunt laudes quas fecit sanctus frater Jacobus de Tuderto, ordinis fratrum minorum," has, in addition to the Italian *Laude*, seven Latin hymns, viz.:

- I. Jesu dulcis memoria,
- II. Verbum caro factum est,
- III. Crux de te volo conqueri,
- IV. Cur mundus militat,
- V. Ave regis angelorum,
- VI. Stabat mater speciosa,
- VII. Stabat mater dolorosa.

Nos. 6 and 7 have the authority of this MS. But a glance at the other entries will lessen the force of this inclusion. No. 1 antedates Jacopone, and is most probably St. Bernard's composition. No. 2 belongs to the twelfth century. No. 4 is very doubtful. An edition of the *Laude* published at Florence in 1490 contains no Latin poems, and in the full edition of his poems edited by the Franciscan Tressati (Venice, 1617) the *Stabat mater dolorosa* does not appear. An argument favorable to the ascription has been based on such expressions in the hymn as:

Sancta mater, istud agas,
Crucifixi fige plagas
Cordi meo valide;
Tui nati vulnerati
Tam dignati pro me pati
Poenas mecum divide,

and

Fac ut portem Christi mortem,
Passionis fac consortem
Et plagas recolere,

and

Fac me plagis vulnerari,

which have been considered as probable references to the wonderful conferring of the Stigmata upon St. Francis. And from this it has been thought a likely supposition that the author of the hymn must have been a Franciscan. This, of course, would not be an identification of the Franciscan with Jacopone; and, as has been pointed out, the Vulgate furnishes texts used in the Breviary (such as: *Quid sunt plagae istae in medio manuum tuarum? Et dicit: His plagatus sum in domo eorum qui diligebant me; as also St. Paul's words: Ego enim stigmata Domini Jesu in corpore mea porto*) which might have suggested the phrases quoted from the hymn.

(c) St. Gregory the Great (*604). The verse form is not, however, older than the middle of the twelfth century.

(d) St. Bernard (*1153); St. Bonaventure (*1274); Gregory XI. (*1378). Speaking of the Flagellants, in whose processions the *Stabat* was sometimes sung, Antonius (called, because of his short stature, Antoninus), the Florentine historian and moralist (*1450), says that the author of the hymn was thought to be a certain Gregory. From the manner of the reference, this Gregory must have been some well-known personage, possibly Gregory XI. (*1378): "Incredibilis devotionis ardore longa horum dealbatorum agmina ad varias urbes commeabant, processionaliter bini pergentes, pacem, misericordiam supplicii clamore saepe clamantia ac laudes et hymnos in latina vel vulgari lingua decantantia, praecipue sequentiam illam quam dicunt Gregorium edidisse: '*Stabat mater dolorosa.*'"

None of the above ascriptions can be considered as better than conjectural; and we are compelled to leave the question unsolved, with the thought of Cardinal Wiseman as a comforting reflection: "The modesty, or to speak more Christianly, the humility of the authors led them to conceal in every way their names; so that while every one admires those sweet and often sublime conceptions, such as are also *Dies irae*, *Stabat mater*, etc., hardly one can be attributed to its author with any degree of certainty. The causes of obscurity are shown to attest the spirit of this age in the close communion and charitable bond without envy and jealousy of different churches and in the humility and true modesty of its saints and sages." (Lectures on Holy Week, p. 122.)

In the following translation from the text of the Roman Missal and Breviary, we have tried to preserve the multiple rhyme observable in the second and sixth stanzas of the Latin.

TEXT OF THE ROMAN MISSAL.

Stabat mater dolorosa
Juxta crucem lacrimosa,
Dum pendebat filius.
Cuius animam gementem,
Contristatam et dolentem,
Pertransivit gladius.

O quam tristis et afflicta
Fuit illa benedicta
Mater unigeniti !
Quae moerebat et dolebat,
Pia mater, dum videbat
Nati poenas inclyti.

Quis est homo qui non fleret,
Matrem Christi si videret
In tanto supplicio ?
Quis non posset contristari
Christi matrem contemplari
Dolentem cum filio ?

Pro peccatis suae gentis
Vidit Jesum in tormentis
Et flagellis subditum ;
Vidit suum dulcem natum
Moriendo desolatum,
Dum emisit spiritum.

Eia mater, fons amoris,
Me sentire vim doloris
Fac, ut tecum lugeam ;
Fac, ut ardeat cor meum
In amando Christum Deum,
Ut sibi complaceam.

TRANSLATION.

O the sadness and affliction
Of the Mother's dereliction
At the Cross of her dear Son!
Through her heart, His woe perceiving,
Broken with excess of grieving,
Passed the Sword of Simeon.

Such a sadness hath no other
Bosom felt, as that blest Mother
Of the Sole-begotten One:
O the swelling grief upwelling,
In that virgin-bosom dwelling,
As she gazed her God upon!

Who could tearless view that loving
Mother, every moment proving
Depths of woe beyond belief?
Who could see, nor share her sorrows,
As at every glance she borrows
From His pains a newer grief?

For His people's sins atoning,
Saw she Jesus bleeding, groaning,
Given up to scourge and rod:
Him Who love alone should waken,
Saw she desolate, forsaken,
Crying yield His soul to God.

Mother, fount of love o'erflowing,
Let me feel thy sorrow, knowing
None such other deep delight:
Let me burn with the sweet fever
Of Christ's love, that I forever
May be pleasing in His sight.

Sancta mater, istud agas,
Crucifixi fige plagas
Cordi meo valide ;
Tui nati vulnerati,
Tam dignati pro me pati,
Poenas mecum divide.

Fac me tecum pie flere,
Crucifixo condolere,
Donec ego vixero ;
Juxta crucem tecum stare,
Et me tibi sociare
In planctu desidero.

Virgo virginum praeclara,
Mihi jam non sis amara,
Fac me tecum plangere ;
Fac, ut portem Christi mortem,
Passionis fac consortem
Et plagas recolare.

Fac me plagis vulnerari,
Fac me cruce inebriari
Et cruore filii.
Flammis ne urar succensus ;
Per te, virgo, sim defensus
In die judicii.

Christe, cum sit hinc exire,
Da per matrem me venire
Ad palmam victoriae :
Quando corpus morietur,
Fac, ut animae donetur
Paradisi gloria.

Amen.

Mother, let my heart be wounded
With His wounds, and the unbounded
Sorrows of the Crucified :
Who, from bending Heaven descending,
Came amending earth's offending—
All His pains with me divide.

Let me stand beside thee weeping,
Ever near to Jesus keeping
Until death mine eyes shall close :
At the Cross of dereliction
I shall share in thy affliction,
See thy tears and feel thy woes.

Virgin, virgins all excelling,
Pity me, and let my swelling
Heart pour forth its flood of tears :
I would share His death, and wear His
Wounds within my heart, and bear His
Dying throes and human fears !

Wound for wound my spirit keeping,
All its senses wholly steeping
In the wine-red cup outpoured—
Let no breath of hell assail me ;
Dearest Mother, do not fail me
At the great Day of the Lord.

Saviour, when the veil is riven,
May thy Mother, throned in Heaven,
Grant the everlasting prize :
When my soul hath cast its burden—
Dust to dust—O grant the guerdon
Won by Thee in Paradise !
Amen.

II. LITURGICAL USE.

It is beyond question that the hymn was well known to all classes of men towards the end of the fourteenth century. The Flagellants had popularized it in their processions too widely and too thoroughly to admit of any doubt in this matter. Did the Church borrow the hymn from these condemned heretics? "Non accepit ecclesia carmen ab haereticis, sed haeretici ex ecclesia prosam deprædati sunt," as Daniel so well remarks in his *Thesaurus* (II., p. 140). No ascription of the hymn has been conjectured save to some churchman, as the names given in the preceding section will sufficiently indicate. And if the ascription to Jacopone be the correct one, it is very likely that from the Franciscan houses the prosa found its way gradually into other missals. The Roman Missal, indeed, introduced it only quite recently (after 1727), but gave it the unique honor amongst sequences of a place in the Breviary, where, divided into three hymns, it adorns the office of the Seven Dolors (the Friday after Passion Sunday).

III. CRITICAL ESTIMATES.

Protestant tributes to the beauty and power of the hymn are apt to be disfigured by wanton references to its "Mariolatry." A bright exception to this kind of criticism is the long and exquisite tribute of the great hymnologist, Daniel, who in his *Thesaurus* calls the *Stabat mater dolorosa* the "queen of sequences" (V., p. 59), and in another place in the same treasury (II., pp. 136-8) speaks at length of the splendid merits of the hymn. "When St. John," he says, "wished to depict for us the sorrowing Mary and her Son, with the loving accuracy and wonderful simplicity eminently characteristic of the evangelists, he contented himself with the single statement: *Stabat juxta crucem mater eius*. Few are the words, but weighty; for in the briefest compass they bring into the light all the longing, the sorrow, the sadness, hidden in Mary's heart. And since in all times many are to be found so bruised and broken by affliction that sorrow lies in their souls like a sword, it is not strange that, in the Roman Church, so many have gone, and still go, in supplication to this Mother of Sorrows, with such an ardor of piety. Witness the statues set up in churches and by the roadsides in honor of this sorrowful Mother; witness the lamps burning, day and night, before her images, the festivals set apart, the sodalities, the sermons, the hymns, the prayers and praises consecrated to her honor. But amongst all the hymns rehearsing the praises of the Mother of Sorrows, the one just given (i. e., the *Stabat mater dolorosa*) holds, by common consent, the first place (*omnium consensu palmare est*). The

first words of the hymn recall briefly the historical narrative; then the poet, with words of honeyed sweetness, begins to paint, as with native colors, the sorrows of Mary. From this it is clear that our hymn, although perhaps similar in some respects to the *Dies irae*, belongs to an entirely different class; for while one of the hymns busies itself with a description of an event upon which, as it were, we ourselves are gazing, the other tries to express the intimate feelings of the soul; while one places before our eyes a certain scene, the other opens up the recesses of the heart. They have therefore this relation to each other, that they cannot be compared; and yet their musical rhythms and phrases have been so perfectly wrought, that not only have they—I shall not say no superior—but no equal amongst hymns.”

Dr. Philip Schaff, in his *Literature and Poetry* (p. 191), says: “The secret of the power of the *Mater Dolorosa* lies in the intensity of feeling with which the poet identifies himself with his theme, and in the soft, plaintive melody of its Latin rhythm and rhyme, which cannot be transferred to any other language. It draws the reader irresistibly into sympathy with the agony described, and makes him a fellow-sufferer with Mary. It fills him with grief for his own sins which have cost such a sacrifice, and with gratitude for the love of the Son of God, who spared not His own life for our redemption.” He then touches, with more mildness, however, than most Protestants, on the favorite objection to the ardent supplications contained in the hymn: “The only objectionable feature in this incomparable poem is a touch of what Protestants call Mariolatry, which excludes it from evangelical hymn books unless the prayer to Mary be changed into a prayer to Christ.” He then rehearses the common objections, but is honest in his endeavor to place before his Protestant readers the distinctions familiar to every Catholic child—a piece of honesty sadly lacking, as a rule, in such hymnological comment as we are now illustrating. It is pleasant, therefore, to come across such a gentle treatment as Dr. Schaff begins to administer: “It is, after all, Christ’s sufferings which were reflected in Mary’s agony; as it is the heavenly beauty of the Christ-child which shines on the faces of the Madonnas of Raphael. We must give to Roman Catholics credit for their distinction between different kinds of worship; adoration (*latria*), which belongs to God alone; veneration (*dulia*), which is due to saints in the presence of God; and a special degree of veneration or semi-adoration [why would not “special degree of veneration” suffice? and what is *semi*-adoration?] which is claimed for the Virgin Mary, as the Mother of the Saviour and the Queen of Saints in heaven. They do not pray to Mary as the giver of the mercies desired, but only as the interceder, thinking that she

is more likely to prevail with her Son than any poor unaided sinner on earth."

In the Proem to his translation, Abraham Coles, M. D., Ph. D., does not hesitate, in lauding the hymn, to use the words "idolatrous" and "Romanist." "The devout Protestant," he remarks, "is necessarily offended in the *Stabat Mater* by a devotion he believes misdirected and idolatrous, in the adoration which it pays to the Virgin. . . . The most zealous Romanist will be constrained to admit that there has been no backwardness evinced on the part of those who are not of his faith to do ample justice to the lyric excellence of the *Stabat Mater*." He appends to the translation a section of "Remarks," in which he discusses more amply the "objectionable features" of the hymn, as though he felt that he had scarce done justice to the matter in his Proem: "No admiration of the lyric excellence of the *Stabat Mater* should be allowed to blind the reader to those objectionable features which must always suffice, as they have hitherto done, to exclude it from every hymnarium of Protestant Christendom. For not only is Mary made the object of religious worship, but the incommunicable attributes of the Deity are freely ascribed to her. Her agency is invoked as if she were the third person of the Trinity, or had powers coördinate and equal." And he continues, through three additional pages, to elaborate his wooden exegesis.

Lovely and pathetic as the *Stabat Mater* is, and in the common judgment of hymnologists, yielding first place in Latin hymnody only to the *Dies irae*, it is nevertheless excluded by Trench* from his ample collection of mediæval hymns. Stern and uncompromising as such a course must appear, it surely seems more reasonable than to spend minute and laborious care upon a rendering of the hymn, and then to usher the translation into public notice with a series of prolegomena and annotations which declare, in many varieties of phrase but with a unique burden of meaning, that the grand hymn is simple idolatry.

IV. TRANSLATIONS.

The *Dolorosa* has been very frequently translated into modern vernacular tongues. In German, Lisco (1843) enumerated 78 versions; and in Dutch, 4 versions. In English, there are probably 40 translations. As in the case of the *Dies irae*, the subtle music of the double rhymes, the melodiousness of the Latin sounds, the compressed character of the Latin syntax, combine to make the hymn well-nigh untranslatable. But the difficulty of the task has appar-

*Saintsbury (*The Flourishing of Romance*, p. 77, footnote) considers French's exclusion of the hymn "a little touch of orthodox prudery."

ently only served to whet the zeal of the translators, and some very good renderings remain to attest the skill and patience of the workmen. Dr. Coles confesses to an earnest desire to do his very best: "In attempting to add another to those already existing, the present translator has been moved by a desire to produce one more literal, if possible, than any he has seen. He is not, he confesses, friendly to free translations. Free, he has observed, is another name for false. A counterfeit is put in place of the genuine; so that instead of a *Stabat* we get only some worthless substitute. He honors that painstaking religious scrupulosity which respects the sacredness of words as well as thoughts; and shuns all sacrilegious license and profane handling—carrying this reverence for the venerated text so far as to be unwilling, if it can possibly be helped, to vary one jot or tittle, either in the way of substitution or alteration."

It should prove interesting to study the attempt of a fine poet like Aubrey de Vere to render the immortal hymn into English verse:

STABAT MATER DOLOROSA.

By the cross of expiation
The Mother stood, and kept her station,
Weeping for her Son and Lord:
With the nails his hands were riven;
Through her heart the sword was driven,
Simeon's dread, predicted sword.

Oh, that blessed one grief-laden,
Blessed Mother, blessed Maiden,
Mother of the All-holy One;
Oh, that silent, ceaseless mourning,
Oh, those dim eyes never turning
From that wondrous, suffering Son.

Who is he of nature human
Tearless that could watch that Woman?
Hear unmoved that Mother's moan?
Who, unchanged in shape and colour,
Who could mark that Mother's dolour,
Weeping with her Son alone?

For his people's sins the All-holy
There she saw, a victim lowly,
Bleed in torments, bleed and die:
Saw the Lord's Anointed taken;
Saw her Child in death forsaken;
Heard his last expiring cry.

Fount of love and sacred sorrow,
Mother, may my spirit borrow
Sadness from thy holy woe;
May it love—on fire within me—
Christ, my God, till great love win me
Grace to please him here below.

Those five wounds of Jesus smitten,
Mother, in my heart be written
Deeply as in thine they be;
Thou my Saviour's cross who bearest,
Thou thy Son's rebuke who sharest,
Let me share them both with thee.

In the passion of my Maker
Be my sinful soul partaker;
Let me weep till death with thee:
Unto me this boon be given,
By thy side, like thee bereaven,
To stand beneath the atoning tree.

Virgin holiest, Virgin purest,
Of that anguish thou endurest
Make me bear with thee my part;
Of his passion bear the token
In a spirit bowed and broken,
Bear his death within my heart.

May his wounds both wound and heal me;
His blood enkindle, cleanse, anneal me;
Be his cross my hope and stay:
Virgin, when the mountains quiver,
From that flame which burns forever,
Shield me on the judgment day.

Christ, when he that shaped me calls me,
When advancing death appals me,
Through her prayer the storm make calm:
When to dust my dust returneth
Save a soul to thee that yearneth;
Grant it thou the crown and palm.

A. de Vere.

General Dix, who had translated the *Dies iræ* at Fortress Monroe during the Civil War, afterwards essayed the *Stabat Mater* under very different circumstances. The field of battle was not so un-

favorable a place for translating the "Great Hymn" as was the "Parisian saloon" in which the Minister Plenipotentiary achieved his version of the *Stabat*: "As I proceeded, I could not but think under how much more favorable circumstances than mine Jacobus de Benedictus must have written the immortal hymn. He was in all probability sitting in his narrow cell, the external world entirely shut out, with nothing before him but a crucifix, to which it was only necessary to lift his eyes when he felt the spirit of inspiration flagging. On the other hand, I was compelled to write in a Parisian saloon, amid the glare of meretricious gilding, almost under the shadow of the great triumphal arch—one of those gigantic memorials of human victories which for the cause of human civilization had much better be forgotten than commemorated; the canvas on the walls swarming with young fauns, cupids, and other Pagan devices. In making the translation I kept in view three or four leading objects which I will briefly state:

- "I. An inflexible adherence to the rhythm.
- "II. A faithful preservation of every thought contained in the original.
- "III. A vigorous exclusion of every thought not contained in it.
- "IV. A preservation, as far as possible, of the tenderness of feeling and expression, which is the characteristic of the hymn."

A partial view of the difficulties encountered in translating such a hymn may be obtained by comparing various renderings of the first stanza:

Stabat mater dolorosa,
Juxta crucem lacrimosa,
Dum pendebat filius;
Cuius animam gementem,
Contristatam et dolentem,
Pertransivit gladius.

Caswall's version carries out the original rhythm only in the first stanza; in the remaining ones, he falls into the much easier single-syllabled rhyme:

At the Cross her station keeping,
Stood the mournful Mother weeping,
Close to Jesus to the last:
Through her heart, his sorrow sharing,
All his bitter anguish bearing,
Now at length the sword had passed.

Lord Lindsay sticks to the rhymes "keeping, weeping," but forthwith sinks into the single rhyme:

By the Cross, sad vigil keeping,
 Stood the mournful mother weeping,
 While on it the Saviour hung:
 In that hour of deep distress,
 Pierced the sword of bitterness
 Through her heart with sorrow wrung.

Dr. Coles cannot avoid the "Weeping, keeping:"

Stood the afflicted mother weeping,
 Near the cross her station keeping
 Whereon hung her Son and Lord;
 Through whose spirit sympathizing,
 Sorrowing and agonizing,
 Also passed the cruel sword.

The Rev. J. S. B. Monsell (who, in his endeavor to avoid the "objectionable features" of the hymn, changes the address to the Mother of Sorrows into addresses to Christ and the Father, thus rendering the hymn "evangelical"), is similarly wedded to the old recurring rhymes "weeping, keeping:"

Stood the mournful Mother weeping,
 By the cross her vigil keeping,
 While her Jesus hung thereon:
 Through her heart, in sorrow moaning,
 With Him grieving, for Him groaning,
 Through that heart the sword hath gone.

So, too, the Rev. Dr. Johnson:

Stood the mournful mother weeping,
 Near the cross her vigil keeping,
 Where He hung, her Son adored.
 Through her soul, of hope forsaken,
 And of mighty sorrows shaken,
 Pierced the sharp relentless sword.

So, too, the Hon. J. L. Hayes:

Stood the grief-struck Mother weeping,
 At the Cross her vigil keeping,
 Where her suffering Son was bound;
 And her heart with anguish groaning
 And his agony bemoaning,
 Bleeds with every bleeding wound.

So, too, the Rev. W. S. Mackenzie, D. D.:

Stood the Virgin-mother weeping
Near the cross, sad vigils keeping
O'er her Son there crucified :
Through her soul in sorrow moaning,
Racked with grief, with anguish groaning,
Pierced the sword as prophesied.

So, too, D. F. McCarthy's fine version :

By the cross, on which suspended,
With his bleeding hands extended,
Hung that Son she so adored,
Stood the mournful Mother weeping,
She whose heart, its silence keeping,
Grief had cleft as with a sword.

In the third stanza the same rhymes are given :

What man is there so unfeeling,
Who, his heart to pity steeling,
Could behold that sight unmoved ?
Could Christ's Mother see there weeping,
See the pious Mother keeping
Vigil by the Son she loved ?

"Anonymous" repeats the rhymes :

There she stood, the mother weeping !
Nigh the Cross sad watches keeping,
While her Son did hang and bleed !
Bitter were her tears and grieving :
Through that bosom, wildly heaving,
There had passed a sword indeed !

"A Protestant Transfusion" by Rev. Henry Mills :

Near the cross was Mary weeping,
There her mournful station keeping,
Gazing on her dying Son :
There in speechless anguish groaning,
Yearning, trembling, sighing, moaning—
Through her soul the sword had gone.

"Anonymous" (from Schaff's *Christ in Song*) :

At the cross her station keeping,
Stood the mournful Mother weeping,
Where He hung, her Son and Lord.
For her soul, of joy bereavèd,
Bowed with anguish, deeply grievèd,
Felt the sharp and piercing sword.

The Catholic translations of the hymn have been thoughtful and accurate. Mr. Orby Shipley has gathered some of these into his *Annus Sanctus*, and they are accessible therefore to the interested student. In the *Catholic World* (April, 1870) a very good version, presumably by a Catholic, appeared as a reprint from the *Democratic Magazine* of thirty years previous, together with a version into Greek by Otto George Mayer. The English translation begins:

Broken-hearted, lo, and tearful,
Bowed before that Cross so fearful,
Stands the Mother by the Son!
Through her bosom sympathizing
In his mortal agonizing
Deep and keen the steel has gone.

Powerful as is the version of Aubrey de Vere, it nevertheless contains occasional (and apparently unnecessary) crudenesses in metre. It would be doubtless interesting to compare further the various attempts to master the great difficulties offered by the monumental hymn even to the most painstaking translator, were not the present paper already over-bulky; and accordingly we must pass on to the question of variant texts without further delay.

VARIANT TEXTS..

In the following text of Georgius Stella (who attributes the hymn to John XXII.), chancellor of Genoa (*c. 1420) stanzas additional to those in the Roman Missal will be indicated by brackets; the minor verbal or phrasal variations need scarcely be noted.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>1. Stabat mater dolorosa
Iuxta crucem lacrimosa,
Dum pendebat filius;
Cuius animam gementem,
Contristantem et dolentem
Pertransivit gladius.</p> | <p>4. Hunc dolorem fac me moestum,
Nec me facias alienum
Ab hoc desiderio.
Illum corde, illum ore
Semper feram cum dolore
Et mentis martyrio.]</p> |
| <p>2. O quam tristis et afflicta
Fuit illa benedicta
Mater unigeniti!
Quae moerebat et dolebat
Et tremebat, dum videbat
Nati poenas inclyti.</p> | <p>5. Quis est homo qui non fleret,
Matrem Christi si videret
In tanto supplicio?
[Quis tam fortis degustaret
Poenas matris, cum clamaret
In tanto iudicio?]</p> |
| <p>3. Quis non potest contristari,
Matrem Christi contemplari
Dolentem cum filio?
[In me sistat dolor tui,
Crucifixo fac me frui,
Dum sum in exilio.</p> | <p>6. Pro peccatis suae gentis
Vidit Christum in tormentis
Et flagellis subditum;
Vidit suum dulcem natum
Morientem desolatum,
Cum emisit spiritum.</p> |

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>7. Eia mater, fons amoris,
Me sentire vim doloris
Fac, ut tecum lugeam :
Fac, ut ardeat cor meum
In amando Christum deum
Et sibi complaceam.</p> | <p>10. Fac me vere tecum flere,
Crucifixo condolere,
Donec ego vixero ;
Iuxta crucem tecum stare,
Te libenter sociare
Cum planctu desidero.</p> |
| <p>8. Sancta mater istud agas,
Crucifixi fige plagas
Cordi meo valide ;
Tui nati vulnerati,
Tam dignati pro me pati,
Poenas mecum divide.</p> | <p>11. Virgo virginum praeclara
Iam non mihi sis amara,
Fac me tecum plangere ;
Fac, ut portem Christi mortem,
Passionis eius sortem
Et plagas recolere.</p> |
| <p>9. [Alma salus, advocata,
Morte Christi desolata,
Miserere populi ;
Virgo dulcis, virgo pia,
Virgo clemens, o Maria,
Audi preces servuli.]</p> | <p>12. Fac me plagis vulnerari,
Cruce fac inebriari
Et cruore filii.
Inflammatum et accensus
Per te, virgo, sim defensum
In die iudicii.</p> |
13. [Fac me cruce custodiri,
Morte Christi praemuniri
Confoveri gratia.]
Quando corpus morietur,
Fac, ut animae donetur
Paradisi gloria.

Another elaboration of the text is found in a work of the Franciscan Bernardinus de Bustis (*1500). The additional stanzas are given here :

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>11. Virgo dulcis, o Maria,
Tu plorabàs voce pia
Coram cruce filium.
Rumpebatur cor Mariae
Deplorantis valde pie :
"O fili dulcissime !</p> | <p>13. "Tu me vides desolatam,
Semivivam, anxiatam,
Et mihi non loqueris.
O Gabriel, illud ave
Dulce nimis et suave
Nunc dat mihi gemitum.</p> |
| <p>12. "Cum te cerno morientem,
Ego perdo cor et mentem
Et tota deficio.
O columba sine felle,
Vas (que) dulci plenum melle,
O fili piissime !</p> | <p>14. "Nunc vertuntur in moerorem
Et in luctum et dolorem
Nunciata gaudia ;
Mihi namque est ablatum
Et in cruce conclavatus
Qui me replet gratia.</p> |

- | | |
|---|--|
| 15. "O crux alta, de te queror,
Mihi nequis esse peior,
O crux crudelissima!
Meum natum tu cepisti,
Ipsum in te suspendisti,
O crux ferocissima! | 16. "Ergo saltem nunc te placa,
Quam exoro voce rauca:
Reddas mihi filium.
Et si non vis te placare
Neque natum mihi dare,
Tu me secum recipe." |
|---|--|
17. Nam consolor, si me capis,
 Si me spernis, tu me tradis
 Mortali supplicio.

V. MUSICAL SETTINGS.

The Stabat Mater, combining as it does epic narration, lyric emotion, and throughout a vivid word-painting, offers much variety in suggestion and in interpretation to the musical creator and artist. In Plain Chant alone there are four musical settings, not to speak of the variations arising from local usage. Of these, the one in the First Mode in the Ratisbon *Graduale* is part of the official chant as recommended several times by Popes Pius IX. and Leo XIII. Its simple melody, sung without harmonization of voice or instruments, is overpowering. A much simpler melody (harmonized, however) is usually sung in churches in this country, as it is suitable for use by a large congregation as well as by a small choir. The Benedictines of Solesmes, in their *Paroissien Romain* give (p. 801) a pleasing variation of this very simple chant, and repeat it in another place in the same volume (p. 1229).

Josquin des Pres, the great Netherlands master, "the idol of Europe" (as Baini styles him), wrote in the fifteenth century a musical setting of the *Stabat* of which Mr. Rockstro declares that "so elaborate is this work, that not one of the most highly developed of the Composer's Masses surpasses it." He was followed by Palestrina in the same task; and, great as had been his success, was distanced wholly by the immortalizing twain of settings composed by Palestrina. Of Pergolesi's *Stabat* we have the interesting comment of the German poet Tieck: "The loveliness of sorrow in the depth of pain, the smiling in tears, the childlike simplicity, which touches on the highest heaven, had to me never before risen so bright in the soul. I had to turn away to hide my tears, especially at the place,

'Vidit suum dulcem natum.' "

Haydn's *Stabat* "is a treasury of refined and graceful Melody." Some less familiar names in the long list are: Steffani, Clari, Astorga, Winter, Raimondi, Vito, Lanza, Inzenga, the Chevalier

Neukomm. Of Rossini's *Stabat* it is unnecessary to speak at great length. It is confessed on all sides to be a wonderful composition, but has not escaped criticism as very inappropriate to the text. But even in this matter it has had some gentle defenders. Rockstro, for instance, remarks: "We do not pause to inquire whether the sensuous beauty of Rossini's *Stabat Mater* is worthy of the subject, or not; but we do say, of critics who judge it harshly, and dilettanti who can listen to it unmoved that they must either be casehardened by pedantry, or destitute of all 'ear for Music.' Rossini had already produced his *William Tell* before he essayed the *Stabat*. Father Taunton defends the *Stabat* in words worth quoting: "To judge it properly one should remember, as in the case of Haydn, that religion to a Catholic is something more personal and intimate than it can be to any one else. Again, to an Italian there is no such thing as the mysterious gloom of religion. He lives in the full sunlight of Catholicism, and the supernatural is part and parcel of his daily life, and to no one is he more tender in his love, childlike and simple as it is, than he is to Our Lady. This, then, is the key to the understanding of Italian Church Music, and to the work in point—the *Stabat Mater*. An Englishman possibly would not have written a *Stabat* like Rossini's—most likely could not—but that is no reason to decry a composition because we are not accustomed to view it from the same point of view as the composer did. . . . As to the *Stabat Mater*, who can doubt the religious sentiment of the opening chorus, or the marvelous expression of which the *Cujus animam* (too often misinterpreted) is capable, the tenderness and pathos of the *Pro peccatis*, and the grandeur of the *Inflammatum*? These, and the unaccompanied quartette *Quando corpus*, will ever hold their place among the best works of modern Church Music" (*History and Growth of Church Music*, pp. 78-9).

The long list may well close with a reference to Dvůřák, who, as Mr. Rockstro says, "in still more modern, and very different musical phraseology," illustrated the perennial freshness and inspiration of the *Stabat Mater*.

H. T. HENRY.

Overbrook Seminary.

AN IRISH HISTORIAN OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

EVERY student of Irish antiquities will welcome this first instalment of a new edition and translation of Keating's *Foras Feasa ar Éirinn* or "Origins of Irish History," due to the pen of a well-known scholar, Mr. David Comyn.¹ The priest, Geoffrey Keating (?1570-1650), was a writer of the old school, an Irish Herodotus, as Dr. Hyde truly puts it, who invented nothing and embroidered little, but who wrote in the current Irish vernacular of the seventeenth century what he found in the old vellums of the monasteries and the brehons. It has been said that Herodotus caught the smile on the face of Greece. On the war-worn face of seventeenth-century Ireland there was no smile to catch—on its lips, however, trembled yet the thoughts and the ideals of a golden age, a faery "Juventus mundi." In matters of fact, less accurate than his contemporaries, the Four Masters, his work is nevertheless independent, drawn from the same class of sources and often from the same "Illuminated Hosts of the Books of Erin." The Four Masters wrote their incomparable annals in an archaic bardic dialect, the property even then of a coterie of antiquarian scribes and teachers, while Keating's diction is that of the best Irish society of his own day, "veritably Irish uncontaminated by English phrases," says Dr. Atkinson, "and written by a master of the language while it was yet a power." But for the unhappy circumstances of his country, thinks Mr. Comyn, he might have been the founder of a modern native historical school in the Irish language.² His contemporaries,

¹ "The History of Ireland," by Geoffrey Keating, D. D., Vol. I., containing the Introduction and the First Book of the History, edited with translation and notes by David Comyn, M. R. I. A., London. Printed for the Irish Texts Society by David Nutt, 57-59, Long Acre, 1900. 8vo. pp. 237.

² During the first half of the seventeenth century the Irish, heavily handicapped as they were and deprived of the power of printing, nevertheless made tremendous efforts to keep abreast of the rest of Europe in science and literature. It was, indeed, an age of national scholarship which has never since been equaled. It was this half century that produced in rapid succession Geoffrey Keating, the Four Masters, and Duaid MacFírlis, men of whom any age or country might be proud, men who, amid the war, rapine and conflagration that rolled through the country at the heels of the English soldiers, still strove to save from the general wreck those records of their country which to-day make the name of Ireland honorable for her antiquities, traditions and history in the eyes of the scholars of Europe. Of these men Keating, as a prose writer, was the greatest. He was a man of literature, a poet, professor, theologian and historian in one. He brought the art of writing limpid Irish to its highest perfection, and ever since the publication of his history of Ireland some two hundred and fifty years ago, the modern language may be said to have been stereotyped. Douglas Hyde, *Literary History of Ireland*. New York (Scribner's), 1899, p. 552.

Lynch, White, O'Sullivan,³ wrote remarkable Irish histories in Latin; MacGeoghegan, at a later date, wrote the history of his native land in French, while the last of the old Irish chronicler-historians, Charles O'Connor, wrote in English, and fell in with the then young procession of critical nineteenth century scholars.⁴ Mr. Comyn, in a too brief preface, notes the extensive reading, happy manner,

³ John Lynch, Archdeacon of Tuam, was the author of the following works:

Eudoxus Alithinologus, *Alithinologia sive veridica responsio*, the Truth told, or a true answer to the invective full of falsehood, fallacies and calumnies against many of the Priests, Nobles and Irish of every rank, delivered by R(ichard) F(arrell) C(apuchin) to the Propaganda, A. D. 1659. Supplementum, 1667.

The same, (Gratianus Lucius) *Cambrensis Eversus seu potius historica fides in rebus hibernicis Giraldo Cambrensi abrogata*, 1662, edited with translation and notes by Matthew Kelly, Celtic Society, 3 vols. Dublin, 1848.

Pii Antistitis Icon, sive de vita et morte Rmi Francisci Kerovani Aladensis Episcopi, Maclovii (St. Malo) 1669, ed. C. P. Meehan, Dublin, 1884. Stephen White, a famous Jesuit, and author of "Apologia pro Hibernia adversus Cambri Calumnias, ed. M. Kelly, Dublin, 1849.

O'Sullivanus Bearus, Philippus, *Historiae Catholicae Hiberniae Compendium, Utisipone, 1621, edidit notisque illustravit M. Kelly, Dublin, 1850*. cf. The Four Masters, ad ann. 1601-1602, and the English account in *Pacata Hibernia*, Ireland appeased and reduced, or a Historie of the late Warres of Ireland, especially within the Province of Munster under the government of Sir George Carew, London, 1633; cf. also Franciscus Porter (Ord. Min. Hib.) *Compendium annalium ecclesiasticorum regni Hiberniae exhibens brevem illius descriptionem et succinctam historiam antiquitatum magis notabilium utriusque status ecclesiastici et civilis, veteris et recentioris*. Rome, 1690, 4o. On Carew, the personal enemy of Keating, see Joyce, *A Short History of Ireland* (Longmans, London, 1893), p. 528, sqq.

Latin was certainly a very usual accomplishment of Irish youth in the latter half of the sixteenth century. In his *Historie of Ireland*, Campion says (1574) that "they speak Latine liks a vulgar language learned in their schools of leachcraft and law, whereat they begin children and hold on sixteen or twentie years." When MacDermot wrote to the Governor, after the Battle of the Curlew Mountains, to inform him of the place where lay the body of Sir Conyers Clifford, he wrote in Latin. (Douglas Hyde, op. cit., p. 530).

"So solicitous were the heads of the great families—the O'Donnells and the MacSwynes of Fanad, for example—for the education of their people, that they took special care to settle large endowments on the houses of the new orders, which, I need not tell you, were always subject to the control of our generals and provincials. The Tertiaries, indeed, did good service in Ireland, for the liberality of the native princes enabled them to diffuse learning among the poorer classes, who were always addicted to book-lore. I myself have met peasant lads educated in those schools who were as familiar with Virgil, Horace, Homer and other classic writers as they were with the genealogies of the Milesian princes." Father Mooney, O. S. F. (1616) in *Meehan's Irish Franciscan Monasteries in the Seventeenth Century* (42nd ed.) Dublin, 1872, p. 66.

It was an Irish Jesuit, William Bathe, who first compiled in Latin the famous "Janua Linguarum" the imitation of which afterwards won for Comenius so great fame.

wealth of reference and illustration, pure local coloring and spirit, of this venerable historian. His style, says the editor, (p. V.) has a charm of its own "which quite escapes in any translation, and can only be fully appreciated by native readers, among whom his works have always enjoyed an unrivalled popularity."

The translation into English by Dermot O'Connor (1723) is pronounced a burlesque by James Hardiman, ignorant and dishonest by Dr. Todd; Mr. Comyn is content to call it unsatisfactory. William Haliday published (1811) a partial translation, and John O'Mahony (1867) gave to the world a faithful rendering of the entire work with copious and valuable notes.⁴ All these translations have now become very rare—hence the timeliness of the one before us.

The principal manuscript used by Mr. Comyn is declared to be most accurate and valuable. It is now in the library of the Franciscan Convent at Dublin, whither it came, some twenty-eight years ago, after a long exile at Louvain and Rome. It was originally written, as it states, in the Convent of Kildare, probably before 1640. It is believed to be in the handwriting of Keating himself (p. XIII.). As the history was completed about 1634, we may have in this manuscript, not only the oldest existing transcript, but the original itself, a fact that reminds us of the eleventh century autograph of Marianus O'Gorman's annals yet preserved in the Vatican. Three other contemporary manuscripts, due to the learned scribes of the O'Mulconry family, have been consulted, as well as later transcripts. Keating never had the good fortune of publishing his own work, but his industry and the devoted zeal of his literary friends, says Mr. Comyn, secured its preservation. Printing in Gaelic was then rare and difficult, especially in Ireland, "but the reproduction of manuscripts was an honorable calling actively pursued, and the copies were so clearly and beautifully executed by professional scribes that the native reader was never so bereft of literature as the absence of printed books might suggest."⁵

⁴ Abbé MacGeoghegan, *History of Ireland, Ancient and Modern*, Translated from the French by Patrick Kelly, Dublin, 1849.

Charles O'Connor (of Belanagar), *Rerum Hibernicarum Scriptores veteres*: 1. *Annales Inisfalenses*; 2. *Annales Buellani*; 3. *Annales Quatuor Magistrorum*; 4. *Annales Ultonenses*. 4 vols., Buckinghamlae, 1814.

⁵ In 1881, Dr. P. W. Joyce brought out for the use of students the first part of the *Foras Feasa*, with an almost literal translation and vocabulary.

The "Introduction" of Keating has recently been edited separately by Mr. Comyn for the convenience of students.

⁶ The Irish having no press of their own in Ireland (though they had some outside of it) were obliged to print and set up all their books abroad, chiefly at Louvain, Antwerp, Rome and Paris. Any attempt to introduce fonts of Irish type in the teeth of the English government would, I think, have been futile, so that except for the works that they were able to print in Irish type abroad and afterwards to smuggle into Ireland during the seven-

The authentic materials for the life of Keating are meagre enough. Such as they are, they may be found in the prefaces to the editions of Haliday and O'Mahoney. He was born at Burges in Tipperary about 1570, and he died in 1650 as parish priest of Tubrid, only a few miles distant from the place of his birth. At an early age he was sent to one of the many Irish ecclesiastical schools on the Continent, probably to Bordeaux (Comyn) or to some Irish school in Spain (Hyde). From the latter quarter of the sixteenth century one evil phase of the general Elizabethan policy for Ireland contemplated compulsory ignorance and consequent barbarism for all faithful Irish Catholics. As a result, nearly every Irish clergyman of note was educated abroad.

"The same to me," says a contemporary Gael, "are mountains or ocean, Ireland or the west of Spain, I have shut and made fast the gates of sorrow over my heart."

The key-note of the English writers on Ireland is henceforth "Education" but strictly Protestant in character and content.⁷ Not that Ireland had suddenly become a land of ignorance. In spite of the severe legislation against the native schools and their teachers,

teenth century was thrown nearly a couple of hundred years out of the world's course by having to use manuscripts instead of printed books. Douglas Hyde, *op. cit.*, p. 534.

⁷ "Almost every native scholar produced by Ireland in the seventeenth century," says Dr. Hyde (*op. cit.* pp. 560-61) seems to have been hampered by persecution in the same way as Keating, and loud and bitter were the complaints of the Irish at the policy of the English Government in cutting them off from education. Peter Lombard, the Catholic Archbishop of Armagh, who died in 1625, and who wrote in Latin and published—abroad of course, he would not well do it at home—a "Commentary on the Kingdom of Ireland," assures his countrymen and all Europe that it had been the steady plan of the English Government to cut off education from the Irish and to prevent them from having a university of their own, despite the keen longing which his countrymen had for liberal studies, and the way in which they had always hitherto distinguished themselves in them. Even, he asserts, while England was still Catholic, her policy had been the same, and when the question of an Irish university was being debated in the English Council it had no bitterer enemy than a celebrated English bishop. When afterwards some one remonstrated with this dignitary for opposing a work so holy and so salutary as the establishment of a Catholic University in Ireland, the answer made him was that it was not as a Catholic bishop he opposed it, but as an English senator. "Well for him," remarks Lombard, grimly, "if in the council of God and his saints, when the severe sentence of the Deity is passed upon the bishop, the senator by a like display of nimble wit may escape it!" When they did get a university it was the Elizabethan and Protestant Trinity. "Toties requisita studiorum universitas," adds Lombard, "ante annos aliquot erecta fuit decreto reginae (tametsi sumptibus indigenarum) juxta civitatem Dublinensem, capacissimum ac splendidissimum, in quo ordinatum est ut disciplinae omnes liberales traderentur, sed ab haereticis magistris, quales cum Hibernia nequaquam subministraret, ex Anglia submissi sunt." *De Hibernia Commentarius*, Louvain, 1632.

The idea of establishing a University in Ireland had been discussed since

it was still possible in Keating's youth to obtain a good classical training in one of the many Latin schools that had long flourished in Ireland, and we may well believe that he obtained therein the elements of intellectual culture and a taste for the antiquities of his country.⁸ Keating no doubt gave a good account of himself in the foreign schools that he frequented—the Irish youth of that period were usually highly prized for their studiousness—"sçavoir sa théologie comme un Hibernois" became a proverb in France.⁹ He returned to Ireland in 1610, and in 1615 had prepared a "Key to the

1560. As early as 1583 it was proposed to open two, one at Limerick, the other at Armagh. Finally, Trinity College was established in 1590. It was endowed with the wealth of the old Church, and to-day possesses no less than 199,573 acres—the one-hundredth part of Irish soil—and disposes of an annual revenue of some \$150,000, not to speak of former generous special allowances and the twenty-one benefices to which it presents, some of which give a revenue of over \$5,000. What wonder that it counts some scholars on its roll-call? cf. Bellesheim, *Geschichte der katholischen Kirche in Irland* (Mainz, 1890), II., 215-216. J. W. Stubbs, *History of the University of Dublin*, Dublin, 1889.

⁸ On Peter White, the prince of Irish schoolmasters and his school at Waterford, in the latter years of the sixteenth century, see Hogan, *op. cit.* p. 51. Anthony a Wood tells us in his *Athenae Oxonienses* (I. 575) that this Oxford graduate "was ejected from his deanery for his religion. He continued, notwithstanding, in his beloved faculty of pedagogy, *which was then accounted a most excellent employment in Ireland by the Catholics*, especially for this reason that the sons of noblemen and gentlemen might be trained up in their religion, and so consequently keep out Protestantcy." In 1582 the future Archbishop Skerret had a school in Galway, where he taught reading, grammar and Christian doctrine. The father of John Lynch, the famous antiquarian and sturdy defender of his country against the aspersions of Gerald Barry, kept a school at Galway that Archbishop Ussher closed in 1617, although it had been founded by the citizens, and attracted great numbers of scholars from Connaught and even the Pale.

⁹ In his *Treatise on the Mass* (1611) Fr. Henry Fitzsimmon says: From about the year 1555, as is well known, these late heresies by force, never by voluntary allowance, oppressed religion in our country, *banished teaching, extinguished learning, carried to foreign countries all instruction*, and forced our youth either at home to be ignorant, or abroad in poverty, rather to glean ears of learning than with leisure to reap any abundancy thereof. Yet such as traveled to foreign countr'ies, notwithstanding all difficulties, often attained to singular perfection and reputation of learning in sundry sciences, to principal titles of universities, to high prelacies, of whom some are yet living, some departed in peace." Hogan, *op. cit.*, p. 4. The letter of St. Ignatius to Cardinal Pole (1555) is well known, requesting the latter to send him talented youth from England and Ireland. On March 17, 1604, Father Aquaviva wrote that the Irish seem made for the work of the society: "admitti Hibernos desiderat omnino Pater Generalis, quum ad institutum nostrum facti quodammodo videantur humilitate, obedientia, charitate et *doctrinae laude* quibus, omnium locorum testimonio, valde excellunt." Father Hogan's eloquent and learned account of a number of seventeenth century Irish Jesuits is ample confirmation of the good judgment of the saint and his first successors. Cf. also his *Hibernia Ignatiana*, or *Lives of Irish Jesuits who flourished from 1547 to 1607, and their Letters on Irish affairs.* Dublin, 1880.

Shield of the Mass" (yet unpublished). Another ascetical work, "The Three Shafts of Death," was written about 1625, but was first published at Dublin in 1890 by Dr. Atkinson. In 1644 Keating built the little church of Tubrid, where he lies buried, but the precise spot is unknown. His days might have passed in tolerable calm, were it not for his courage in denouncing from the altar the improper relations of a Catholic lady with Sir George Carew, the cruel President of Munster. She set in motion against him the anti-popery laws and the good doctor was obliged to take to the mountains, where he led a wandering life for some years, particularly among the faithful tribesmen of the Glen of Aherlow.¹⁰ Here he conceived the notion of writing anew the history of Ireland, being moved thereto by the injustice and malignity of "every modern Englishman who speaks of the country." He believed himself especially called to the work, as he was of Anglo-Norman descent—but higher qualifications lay in his early training and his possession of many valuable manuscripts long since lost.¹¹ Moreover, there still

¹⁰ A good idea of the venerable historian's trials may be gained from the story of the sufferings of his brilliant contemporary, Father Henry Fitzsimon, S. J., during the winter of 1641 in the same Wicklow glens and mountains. "Winding his way by Dundrum or Terenure, through sequestered woods and dells, climbing steep hills, creeping and moving from place to place in order to escape his pursuers, traveling on foot over rough rockways, on to Glencree where the old maps mark a mountain and bog, and where he was sheltered in a shepherd's cabin in a bog. There among the faithful clans of Wicklow he was safe from the pursuit of those who thirsted for his blood; and he spent the dreary winter, or two winters exposed to the fury of storms and rain. His bed was a pad of straw, which was always wet with rain from the roof, or with "the rising and coming of the waters of the bog," while the rents in the thatch of his wretched hut allowed him to gaze on the glories of the starry heavens." Hogan, *Distinguished Irishmen of the Seventeenth Century*, London, 1894.

¹¹ Keating not only had with him some of the oldest books of Irish history, such as the "Book of Invasions," at the commencement of which are recorded the ancient traditions of the origin of the Milesian race, but of the successive colonizations of Erin by the various waves of the Celtic family which reached this island from the European Continent before the time of Milidh or Milesius. And he must have had with him some collections which contained many of the pieces I have classified as the Historic Tales. Keating's work consists of nothing more than a compilation of these materials, as many as he had with him in his wanderings; and he seems to have done nothing but abridge, and arrange chronologically, such accounts of historic facts as he found in them, never departing the least from what he saw before him, and often preserving even the arrangement and the style. It is greatly to be regretted that a man so learned as Keating (one who had access, too, at some period of his life to some valuable and ancient MSS. since lost) should not have had time to apply to his materials the rigid test of that criticism so necessary to the examination of ancient tales and traditions—criticism which his learning and ability so well qualified him to undertake. As it is, however, Keating's book is of great value to the student, so far as it contains at least a fair outline of our Ancient History, and so far as regards the language in which it is written, which is regarded as

abounded in Ireland antiquarian families like the O'Clerys, genealogists like the MacFirbis (Forbes), whose noblest representative, Donald MacFirbis, contemporary of Keating, was a lineal descendant of Dathi, the last pagan monarch of Ireland, and one of whose ancestors had compiled the famous "Book of Lecan," while his own extant "Book of Genealogies" would fill 1,300 large quarto pages. MacFirbis either compiled or wrote out the "Chronicon Scotorum" and apparently from manuscripts of his family; he also "compiled a glossary of the ancient laws, of which only a fragment is preserved, and made copies of five other ancient glossaries and law tracts."

Moreover, the archaic monuments of Irish local history were yet numerous enough—topography, architecture, clan-names, tribal reminiscences, local traditions, a multitude of dates and stories, saga-like, if we will, but rich in national sense, color and spirit. It was not yet necessary to pursue the old and the feeble to catch from their lips the last echoes of an independent racial life and ethos. The fabric of national existence, though seriously undermined and inhumanly isolated, still stood, peculiar and lonely enough, but yet an object of the most intense reverence to all Irishmen.

I.

The "Introduction" of Keating to his charming narrative of Irish history is so fresh and personal, breathes so vividly and forcefully the spirit of his own time, that our readers will scarcely be displeased

a good specimen of the Gaedhlic of his time." Cf. O'Curry, *Manuscript Materials of Irish History*, p. 441.

Among the most valuable ancient books of Irish history now apparently hopelessly lost are the following: *Tain Bo Chualligne*, or *Cattle Spoil of Cooley*, *The Cullmenn* or *Great Skin Book*, *The Saltair of Tara*, *The Book of the Uacongball* (O'Connell), extant at Kildare in 1626; *The Cin of Drum Snechta*, *The Books of Salnt Longarad*, *The Book of St. Mochta*, *The Book of Cuana*.

Of the following almost all existed prior to the year 1100: *The Book of Dubhdaleithe*; *The original Leabhar na h'Uidhre*, or *Book of the Dun Cow*; A volume known as "*The Book Eaten by the Poor People in the Desert*"; *The Short Book of Monasterboice*; *The Red Book of Mac Egan*; *The Book of Leithlin*; *The Book of O'Scoba of Clonmacnols*; *The "Duil" of Drom Ceat*; *The Book of Clonsost*; *the Book of Clualn Eldhneach*; *The Saltair of Cashel*; *The Yellow Book of Slane*; *The Books of Eochaidh O'Flanagan*; *The Book of Inis an Dúln*; *The Book of Flann of Monasterboice*; *The Book of Flann of Dungiven*; *The Book of Downpatrick*; *the Book of Derry*; *The Book of Sábhail Patrick*; *The Black Book of St. Molaga*; *The Yellow Book of St. Molling*; *The Yellow Book of Mac Murrough*; *The Book of Armagh* (not the one extant).

"The books of saga, poetry and annals that have come down to our day, though so vastly more ancient and numerous than anything that the rest of Western Europe has to show, are yet an almost unappreciable fragment of the literature that at one time existed in Ireland." (Hyde, *op. cit.*, p. 263.)

to hear some echoes of the first of modern historians of Ireland. What rouses the ire of Keating is the old note of hatred and self-interest, reinforced by the written calumny, the old note of violent injustice allied with the arrogance and superciliousness of a scholarship that was too racial in its character, too exclusively national in its scope, in time made fiercely narrow and intolerant by the added antithesis of religious warfare.

The reader will remember that the Ireland of Keating's youth was still a national entity, with its ancient constitution operative, its immemorial legislation still working, both in written code and consuetudinary acceptance, with an intense primitive individualism that manifested itself in the superb personalities of men like Shane O'Neill, Sir Cahir O'Doherty, Donal O'Sullivan Beare, Tyrone, Tyrconnell, and a hundred others—men whose praises are often in the mouths of those old European chroniclers who have related for us the moving continental drama of the later sixteenth and the early seventeenth centuries. Never was the national self-consciousness of Ireland clearer, holier, than from the death of Elizabeth to the death of Charles I. (1603-1649), precisely the flower of Keating's manhood.¹² The native learning, refinement, life-philosophy, imbibed from the remotest past, enhanced by the picturesque and significant customs of an eminently social and lively race, emphasized by contrast with a certain prosy dulness and vulgarity of the Calvinist Sassenach, never seemed things of a higher value, or more worth fighting and dying for than during the days when the political success of Protestantism was still an open question, both in England and on the Continent, when it was still uncertain that the Middle Age, with its world of splendid ideals and hopes, its rich cycle of romantic yearnings and affections, was declining or even dead.

In the opening words of Keating there is something grave and magisterial, as befits him who was the first to be the intermediary to the modern world of the story of ancient Scotia. Before him there had been admirable annalists, and their work was even then

¹² The first half of the seventeenth century saw an extraordinary re-awakening of the Irish literary spirit. This was the more curious because it was precisely at this period that the old Gaelic polity, with its habitual system, brehon law, hereditary bards, and all its other supports, was being upheaved by main force and already beginning to totter to its ruin. This was the period when to aggravate what was already to the last degree bitter—the struggle for the soil and the racial feuds—a third disastrous ingredient, polemics, stepped in, and inflamed the minds of the opposing parties with the additional fanaticism of religious hatred. Yet, whether it is that their works have been better preserved to us than those of any other century, or whether the very nearness of the end inspired them to double exertions, certain it is that the seventeenth century, and especially the first half of it, produced among the Irish a number of most gifted men of letters." Hyde, *op. cit.*, p. 514.

culminating in the *Annals of Donegal* (Four Masters), in some senses the most unique of all the historical enterprises of the daring seventeenth century. After these writers, the way was open for that large philosophic history of Ireland which yet awaits its Von Ranke or its Michelet. And while Keating's narrative is far from the formal perfection of numerous modern historians, it is so only because, unlike them, he was the first to beat out his own path. Had there been more English scholarship like that of Ussher and Sir James Ware, broad, intelligent, even somewhat sympathetic, and less like that of Edmund Spenser and the Elizabethan historians whom the latter helped to indoctrinate, it would have been better for the world of letters. A multitude of curious documents, the product of the peculiar and isolated, but highly original and archaic, Gaelic culture of the Middle Ages would have reached our own time, and all the smaller sciences that live on the crumbs which fall from the splendid banquet table of History would be to-day incredibly richer. The "spacious times of great Elizabeth" would not be disfigured by the red streak of blood that no ingenuity can erase, no cant explain away. We should not have had to wait for a Macpherson to enrich the literatures of modern times with the glorious melancholy of the Ossianic soul-searchings, nor for a Burke and a Grattan to endow English rhetoric with a new stream of Keltic color and music that often raises it well nigh the level of the best Greek speech, nor for a Gaston Paris and a D'Arbois de Jubainville to reveal the true sources of mediæval romanticism, nor for a Zeuss and a Diefenbach to reconstruct that daily speech of Patrick and Brigid and Columbkille in which they won away from pagan Ireland its great heart and laid it at the feet of Jesus Christ, perhaps the richest and most influential, certainly the sincerest of His conquests.

"Whosoever proposes," says Keating, in his opening paragraph, "to trace and follow up the ancient history and origin of any country ought to determine on setting down plainly the method which reveals most clearly the truth of the state of the country, and the condition of the people who inhabit it: and forasmuch as I have undertaken to investigate the groundwork of Irish historical knowledge, I have thought at the outset of deploring some part of her affliction and of her unequal contest; especially the unfairness which continues to be practised on her inhabitants, alike the old foreigners who are in possession more than four hundred years from the Norman invasion down, as well as the native Irish who have had possession during almost three thousand years. For there is no historian of all those who have written on Ireland from that epoch that has not continuously sought to cast reproach and blame both on the old foreign settlers and on the native Irish.

Whereof the testimony given by Cambrensis, Spenser, Stanhurst, Hammer, Camden, Barckly, Moryson, Davies, Camplon, and every other new foreigner who has written on Ireland from that time, may bear witness; inasmuch as it is almost according to the fashion of the beetle they act, when writing concerning the Irish.¹³ For it is the fashion of the beetle,

¹³ Fynes Moryson (1566-1617?) *An Itinerary* by Fynes Moryson, Gent, of ten years travel through the twelve domains of Germany, Bohmerland, Switzerland, Netherland, Denmark, Poland, England, Scotland and Ireland.

when it lifts its head in the summertime, to go about fluttering, and not to stoop towards any delicate flower that may be in the field, or any blossom in the garden, though they be all roses or lilies, but it keeps bustling about until it meets with dung of horse or cow, and proceeds to roll itself therein. Thus it is with the set above-named; they have displayed no inclination to treat of the virtues or good qualities of the nobles among the old foreigners and the native Irish who then dwelt in Ireland; such as to write on their valour and on their piety, on the number of abbeys they had founded, and what land and endowments for worship they had bestowed on them; on the privileges they had granted to the learned professors of Ireland, and all the reverence they manifested towards churchmen and prelates: on every immunity they secured for their sages, and the maintenance they provided for the poor and the orphans; on each donation they were wont to bestow on the learned and on petitioners, and on the extent of their hospitality to guests, inasmuch that it cannot truthfully be said that there ever existed in Europe folk who surpassed them in their own time, in generosity or in hospitality, according to their ability. Bear witness the literary assemblies

1 vol. folio, London, 1617. The part concerning Ireland was republished in 1735 at Dublin, under the title, *A History of Ireland*, 1599. 1605; also in Henry Morley's *Carisbrooke Library*, 1890.

Sir John Davies (1569-1626). *A Discovery of the True Causes why Ireland was never entirely subdued nor brought under obedience of the Crown of England until the beginning of his Majestie's happie Reign*, London, 1612.

Richard Stanyhurst (1547-1618), translator of Vergil, uncle of Archbishop Ussher, descendant of an old Anglo-Irish family of Dublin, wrote in 1569 for the first volume of Holinshed's *Chronicles*, a *History of Ireland*. It was first published with Stanyhurst's *Description of Ireland*, 1586-87. It was reprinted by Ware in his *History of Ireland* (1633) at the same time as Spenser's *View of the State of Ireland*, written in 1596, but then published for the first time. Later Stanyhurst became a Catholic, and retired to the Continent where he published "*De rebus in Hibernia gestis*," Antwerp, 1584. He is said to have regretted his unfavorable attitude toward the Catholic Irish.

Meredith Hanmer (1548-1604) *A Chronicle of Ireland*, published for the first time by James Ware in 1633. Hanmer was the first translator into English of the ecclesiastical histories of Eusebius, Socrates, Theodoret and Evagrius, London, 1577. He held several benefices in Ireland under the Establishment (1591-1603).

Edmund Campion, *The Historie of Ireland*, 1569, published first by Richard Stanyhurst in Holinshed's *Chronicles*, 1586-87, and reprinted in Sir James Ware's *History of Ireland*. Dublin, 1633, also by the Hibernia Press, Dublin, 1809. Campion wrote among other things a brochure "*De Jure Academico*" (*De Homine Academico*) Dublin, 1569, Antwerp, 1632, a kind of sketch of the university man, especially the ecclesiastical student. It is found in his "*Opuscula Omnia*," Vienna ed., 1679. For a full account of the blessed martyr Campion see Gillow's "*Bibliographical Dictionary of English Catholics*," Vol. I. He got his knowledge of Ireland during a brief stay at Dublin among the Anglo-Irish Stanyhursts, and others of the dominating class.

A curious specimen of contemporary English ideas of the native Irish is the now very rare blackletter poem, dedicated to Sir Philip Sidney and lately offered for sale at Murray's, "*The Image of Irelande, with a Discoverie of Woodkarne, wherein is moste lively expressed, the Nature and Qualitie of the jaled (sic) Wilde Irishe Woodkarne, their notable apnesse celeritie and pronesse to Rebellion..also their habite and apparell is there plainly showne. The Execrable Life and miserable of Rorio Roge..lastly the Commyng in of the greate Oneale of Irelande to the Right Honourable Sir Henry Sidney (Lord Deputie), etc., made and devised anno 1578 and published by the saled Authour, this present yere of Our Lorde 1581, for pleasure and delight of the well disposed reader.*"

which were proclaimed by them, a custom not heard of among any other people in Europe, so that the stress of generosity and hospitality among the old foreigners and the native Irish of Ireland was such that they did not deem it sufficient to give to any who should come seeking relief, but issued a general invitation summoning them, in order to bestow valuable gifts and treasure on them. However, nothing of all this is described in the works of the present-day foreigners, but they take notice of the ways of inferiors and wretched little hags, ignoring the worthy actions of the gentry: yet as far as regards the old Irish, who were inhabiting this island before the Norman invasion, let it appear whether there has been in Europe any people more valiant than they, contending with the Romans for the defense of Scotland." (Op. cit. p. 3.)

In the timidity of Greeks and Romans before distant and unexplored seas the ancient Irish found freedom from invasion, but not from the misrepresentation of that peculiar gossip which the sea-life breeds, either on board ship, or in the intervals of harbor-idleness and ease. In the folios of old Bouquet one may find collected all the wild and improbable, certainly unsubstantiated, sailor-talk and trader-talk that was current within the civilized world of Greece and Rome about the outlying masses of Keltdom. They were "barbarians" as much as Teutons and Scythians, and the Greek genius was as little conscientious in regard to their international repute as the Roman genius was equitable in its political dealings with that world of humankind that lay outside the "orbis terrarum" or the Cosmopolis of the great Inland Sea. To the geographer Strabo and the polyhistor Solinus Keating pays his respects. Curiously enough it is an Irish hand, in all probability, which transcribed for us the manuscript of Solinus that has saved his text for the printer. Certainly he was known and used at the court of Charlemagne by the Irish geographer, Dicuil of Cluanmicnois, and the Irish savant, Dungal, whose books were once the pride of the library of Bobbio. Nor is it so strange, when we remember that by the same hands were transcribed and saved the surveys of the Roman Empire, notably that of the end of the fourth century under Theodosius.

"There are some ancient authors who lay lying charges against the Irish; such as Strabo, who says in his fourth book that the Irish are man-eating people. My answer to Strabo is, that it is a lie for him to say that the Irish are a people who eat human flesh; for it is not read in the ancient record that there was ever one in Ireland who used to eat human flesh, but Eithne the loathsome, daughter of Criomhthann, son of Eanna Cinnslolach, king of Leinster, who was in fosterage with the Delsi of Munster: and she was reared by them on the flesh of children, in hope that thereby she would be sooner marriageable. For it had been promised to them that they should receive land from the man to whom she would be married; and it is to Aonghus, son of Nadfraoch, king of Munster, she was married, as we shall relate hereafter in the body of the history. Understand, reader, since the antiquaries do not suppress this disgusting fact, which was a reproach to the daughter of a king of Leinster, and the wife of a king of Munster, that they would not conceal, without recounting it in the case of lesser people than they, if it had been a custom practised in Ireland: wherefore it is false for Strabo to say that it was a custom for the Irish to eat human flesh, since this was never done among them but by the aforesaid girl, and even that in time of paganism. My answer also to St. Jerome, who relates this same thing, writing against Jovinian, is that it must have been a base asserter of lies who informed him, and therefore it ought not be brought as a charge against the Irish.

Solinus, in the twenty-first chapter, says that there are no bees in Ire-

land; and he says, that it is from the point of a sword the first bit is tasted by a male child in Ireland. He says, moreover, that the Irishman is wont, when his enemy is slain by him, to bathe himself in the blood. It is clear from the ancient record, which will be (found) in the history, that every one of these things is false. Pomponius Mela, in the third book, says these words, speaking of the Irish, "a people ignorant of all the virtues:" and so of many other ancient foreign authors who wrote rashly without evidence concerning Ireland, on the lying statements of false witnesses, whom it would not be right to trust in such a matter: wherefore, Camden, setting down the testimony of these people concerning Ireland, says these words: "We have not (says he) credible witness of these things." It is clear that it is false to say that there were not bees in Ireland, according to the same Camden, where he says, speaking of Ireland: "Such is the quantity of bees there, that it is not alone in apiaries or in hives they are found, but (also) in trunks of trees, and in holes of the ground." (Ibid, p. 9.)

II.

The malevolent ignorance of Gerald Barry was always to the Irish a stone of scandal. This brilliant war correspondent of the time of Henry II. flitted about Ireland for a few months in the wake of the iron knights who overthrew the light-armed natives, and demonstrated the value of stone castles as against painted wattle-burgs, somewhat as the modern cruiser humiliated the old line-of-battle ship. Half-Welshman, half-Norman, he was just the man to tickle the ears of a multitude of Oxford undergraduates with the story of the uncouth ways of innermost Ireland.¹⁴ The looseness and inaccuracy of this writer are briefly exposed by Keating; a more complete demolition awaited him at the hands of Dr. Lynch in his "*Cambrensis Eversus*."

"Cambrensis says, in his twenty-second chapter, that whenever the nobles of Ireland are making a compact with each other, in presence of a bishop, they kiss at that time a relic of some saint, and that they drink each other's blood, and at that same time they are ready to perpetrate any treachery on each other. My answer to him here (is) that there is not a lay or a letter, of old record or of ancient text, chronicle or annals, supporting him in this lie: and, moreover, it is evident that it was obligatory on the antiquaries not to conceal the like of this evil custom, and even to put it in (their) manuscript on pain of losing their professorship, if it had been practised in Ireland. Wherefore it is clear that it is a lie Cambrensis has uttered here. Cambrensis says, in his tenth chapter, that the Irish are an inhospitable nation: here is what he says: 'Moreover, this nation is an inhospitable nation' (says he). However, I think Stanlhurst sufficient in his history by way of reply to him in this matter; here is what he says, speaking of the generosity of the Irish: 'Verily (he says), they are a most hospitable people; and there is no greater degree in which you may earn their gratitude, than freely, and of your own will, to make your resort their houses.' Hence it may be inferred, without leave of Cambrensis that they are hospitable people, (and) truly generous in regard to food. Cambrensis says, where he writes concerning Ireland, that it was the wife of the king of Meath who eloped with Diarmuid of the foreigners; yet this is not true for him, but she was the wife of Tighearnan O'Rualrc, King of Brefny, and daughter of Murchadh, son of Flann, son of Maoliseachlainn, king of Meath, and Dearbhfor gall was her name. He says, moreover, that it is from Sliev Bloom the Sulr, Nore, and Barrow take their rise, though that is not true for him, for it is clear that it is from the brow of Sliev Bloom, on the east side, the Barrow springs, and that it is from the brow of Sliev Aidun, which is called the mountain of Gap in Ikerrin, the Sulr and the Nore rise." (Ibid, p. 19.)

¹⁴ Giraldus Cambrensis, Works, edited by J. S. Brewer and James F. Dimock. 7 vols. 1861-1877 (Rolls Series). Cf. especially the "*Expugnatio*" and the "*Topographia*."

One of the curiosities of English literature is the poet Spenser's work on Ireland.¹⁵ The Irish problem was then, as now, the thorn in the side of England; the poet, as the holder of a petty Irish office, has only counsels of cruelty and despair—his book breathes none of the spirit of the "Faery Queen," most of which, nevertheless, he wrote in Ireland,

"amongst the coolly shade
Of the green alders, by the Mullia's shore."

The sacerdotal soul of Keating holds no resentment against the unfortunate victim of his own harsh and despotic counsels, yet his falsehoods, inaccuracy, and incompetency in the matter of Irish history must needs be rebuked:

"Spenser, in his narrative, says that Egfrid, king of the Northumbrians, and Edgar, king of Britain, had authority over Ireland, as may be read in the thirty-third page of his history: yet this is not true for him, because the old records of Ireland are opposed to that, and, moreover, British authors themselves confess that the Saxons did not leave them any ancient texts, or monuments, by which they might know the condition of the time which preceded the Saxons. For Gildas, an ancient British author says, that the monuments, and consequently the history of the Britons, were destroyed by the Romans and by the Saxons. Samuel Daniel, in the first part of his chronicle, agrees with this author on the same matter, and Rlder, in the Latin Dictionary he wrote, where he treats of this word Britannia; moreover he says, that it is not from Brutus Britain is called Britannia, and, if it were, that it should be Brutia or Brutica it should be called; and it were likely, if it had been from Brutus it was named, that Julius Caesar, Cornelius Tacitus, Diodorus Siculus, or Bede, or some other ancient author would have stated whence is this word Britannia; and they knew not whence is the name of their own country, it was no wonder they should be in ignorance of many of the ancient concerns of Britain, and therefore, it is not strange that Spenser likewise should be ignorant of them." (Ibid, p. 25.)

Richard Stanyhurst (1547-1618) contributed no little to the caricature that long passed for true Irish history in the best society of England: *odisse quem lacseris* seems to have been his motto. His contributions to the first volume of Holinshed's Chronicles and his later account of Irish history printed on the Continent, whither he had fled from the vengeance of Elizabeth, irritated not a little the Irish, all the more as, in the meantime, Stanyhurst had passed over to the Catholic faith. This fantastic translator of Vergil was the uncle of Archbishop Ussher, and was descended from an Anglo-Irish family long settled in the land, and prominent in the English administration. Of his writings on Ireland, Sir James Ware said that they indulged in malicious misrepresentation, and in the Dictionary of National Biography Sidney Lee accuses him of want of

¹⁵ "It is certain that the reign of Elizabeth was the great crisis of modern Ireland. It is certain that succeeding reigns, with a few brief exceptions, adopted with greater or less severity, the maxims of Elizabeth's policy; and it is equally certain that whatever was irritating or oppressive in that policy was, if not originated, at least recommended by the gentle Spenser." *Dublin Review*, Vol. XIII. (I. Series), pp. 415-416. "He found England prejudiced, he confirmed her; he found Ireland miserable, and plunged her still deeper in the gulf" (ibid, p. 445).

sympathy with the natives and of "prejudiced misrepresentation." It was from the Stanyhurst circle that Campion drew his erroneous judgments on the character and temper of the Irish.

Of the latter's work, Dr. Gillow says that Campion devoted ten weeks to its hasty composition, and that it is to be looked on less as serious history than as a pamphlet to prove that education was the only means of taming the Irish.¹⁶ The cruel heart of Elizabeth needed first some Christian training, as the fate of Campion himself would one day prove. This blot on the illustrious Jesuit's career was washed out in his martyr's blood.

"From the worthlessness of the testimony Stanihurst gives concerning the Irish, I consider that he should be rejected as a witness, because it was purposely at the instigation of a party who were hostile to the Irish that he wrote contemptuously of them; and, I think, that hatred of the Irish must have been the first dug he drew after his first going into England to study, and that it lay as a weight on his stomach till, having returned to Ireland, he ejected it by his writing. I deem it no small token of the aversion he had for the Irish, that he finds fault with the colonists of the English province for that they did not banish the Gaelic from the country at the time when they routed the people who were dwelling in the land before them. He also says, however excellent the Gaelic language may be, that whoever smacks thereof, would likewise savour of the ill manners of the folk whose language it is. What is to be understood from this, but that Stanihurst had so great a hatred for the Irish, that he deemed it an evil that it was a Christian-like conquest the Gail had achieved over Ireland and the Gael, and not a pagan conquest. For, indeed, he who makes a Christian conquest thinks it sufficient to obtain submission and fidelity from the people who have been subdued by him, and to send from himself other new people to inhabit the land over which his power has prevailed, together with the people of that country. Moreover, it is the manner of him who makes a pagan conquest, to bring destruction on the people who are subdued by him, and to send new people from himself to inhabit the country which he has taken by force. But he who makes a Christian conquest extinguishes not the language which was before him in any country which he brings under control: it is thus William the Conqueror did as regards the Saxons. He did not extinguish the language of the Saxons, seeing that he suffered the people who used that language to remain in that country, so that it resulted therefrom that the language has been preserved from that time down among the Saxons. Howbeit, it is a pagan conquest which Hengist, the chief of the Saxons made over the Britons, since he swept them from the soil of Britain, and sent people from himself in their places; and having altogether banished every one, he banished their language with them. And it is the same way Stanihurst would desire to act by the Irish; for it is not possible to banish the language without banishing the folk whose language it is; and, inasmuch as he had the desire of banishing the people whose language it was, and, accordingly, he was hostile to the Irish; and so his testimony concerning the Irish ought not to be received.

"Stanihurst also finds fault with the lawgivers of the country, and with its physicians: although I wonder how he ventured to find fault with them, seeing that he understood neither of them, nor the language in which the skill of either class found expression, he being himself ignorant and uninformed as regards the Gaelic, which was their language, and in which the legal decisions of the country and the (books of) medicine were written. For he was not capable of reading either the law of the land or the medicine in their own language, and if they had been read to him, he had no comprehension of them. Accordingly, I think that it is the same case with him, depreciating the two faculties we have mentioned, and the case of the blind man who would discriminate the colour of one piece of cloth from another: for as the blind man cannot give a decision between the two colours, because he does not see either of them, in like manner, it was not possible for him to form a judgment between the two aforesaid faculties, inasmuch as he never understood the books in which they were written, and did not even

¹⁶ Dictionary of National Biography, vol. LIV., p. 90, cf. Gillow, Bibliographical Dictionary of English Catholics, vol. I., 376.

understand the doctors whose arts these were, because the Gaelic alone was their proper language, and he was out and out ignorant of it." (*Ibid.*, p. 35.)

No profession in sixteenth and seventeenth century Ireland was more odious to the English government than the strolling harper. Quick of wit, free and bold and biting in speech, bound by ties of blood to the great chieftains and ecclesiastics, himself an archaic element of the constitution, the walking embodiment of "Irishry," the very tocsin of rebellion, the prophet of a passionate mystic, uncompromising nationalism, he was also the pamphleteer and the journalist of the day, dreaded beyond measure by the great folk of Dublin Castle. Hence the antipathy of the class from which Stanyhurst sprang.

He finds fault also with those who play the harp in Ireland, and says, that they have no music in them. It is likely that he was not a judge of any sort of music, and especially of Irish music, he being unacquainted with the rules which appertain to it. I think Stanyhurst has not understood that it is thus Ireland was (being) a kingdom apart by herself, like a little world, and that the nobles and the learned who were long ago arranged to have jurisprudence, medicine, poetry, and music established in Ireland with appropriate regulations; and, therefore, it was not seemly for him to have formed and delivered a hasty rash judgment censuring the music of Ireland. It is a marvel to me that he had not read Cambrensis in the nineteenth chapter, where he praises the music of the Irish, unless it were that he had determined to attain a degree beyond Cambrensis in disparaging the Irish: for there is nothing at all in which Cambrensis more commends Irishmen than in the Irish music. Here is what he says in the same chapter: "Instruments of music alone I find the diligence of this nation praiseworthy, in which, above every nation that we have seen, they are incomparably skillful." As he says further, according to the same chapter, here is the information he gives concerning Irish music, praising it: "Their melody," says he, "is perfected and harmonized by an easy quickness, by a dissimilar equality, and by a discordant concord." From this it may be understood, on the testimony of Cambrensis, that it is false for Stanyhurst to say that there is no music in Irish melody. It is not true for him, either, what he says, that the greater part of the singing folk of Ireland are blind; for it is clear that, at the time he wrote his history, there was a greater number of persons with eyesight engaged in singing and playing than of blind people, so from that down, and now, the evidence may rest on our contemporaries.

"Understand, reader, that Stanyhurst was under three deficiencies for writing the history of Ireland, on account of which it is not fit to regard him as an historian. In the first place, he was too young, so that he had not had opportunity for pursuing inquiry concerning the antiquity of this country, on which he undertook to write. The second defect, he was blindly ignorant in the language of the country in which were the ancient records and transactions of the territory, and of every people who had inhabited it; and, therefore, he could not know these things. The third defect, he was ambitious, and accordingly, he had expectation of obtaining an advantage from those whom he was incited to write evil concerning Ireland: and, moreover, on his having subsequently become a priest, he promised to recall most part of the contemptuous things he had written concerning Ireland, and I hear that it is now in print, to be exhibited in Ireland." (*Ibid.*, p. 39.)

Not all the writers of Ireland were hopelessly prejudiced, Keating can cite, without blame, the antiquarian jurist Camden, in his description of the peculiar system by which law, medicine, history, racial tradition and custom, were handed down among the Irish. The more intimate knowledge of the native historian permits him to add life and color to the barren statement of the English judge.

Even to-day, we must admire their excellent ancient provisions for the storing of erudition, its immunity and unbroken use.

"Camden says it is a system among the Irish for their nobles to have lawgivers, physicians, antiquaries, poets and musicians, and for endowments to be bestowed on them, and also their persons, lands, and property to enjoy immunity. Here is what he says speaking of them: "These princes (he says) have their own lawgivers, whom they call 'brehons,' their historians for writing their actions, their physicians, their poets, whom they name 'bards,' and their singing men, and the land appointed to each one of these, and each of them dwelling on his own land, and, moreover every one of them of a certain family apart; that is to say, the judges of one special tribe and surname, the antiquaries or historians of another tribe and surname, and so to each one from that out, they bring up their children and their kinsfolk, each one of them in his own art, and there are always successors of themselves in these arts.'"¹⁷

"From these words of Camden it is clear that the order is good which the Irish had laid down for preserving these arts in Ireland from time to time. For they assigned professional lands to each tribe of them, in order that they might have sustenance for themselves for the cultivation of the arts, that poverty should not turn them away; and, moreover, it is the most proficient individual of one tribe or the other who would obtain the professorship of the prince of the land which he held; and it used to result from that that every one of them would make his best efforts to be well versed in his own art in the hope of obtaining the professorship in preference to the rest of his tribe: and it is thus it is done beyond the sea now by many who go to obtain (college) chairs in consideration of their learning. It was all the more possible to preserve these arts, as the nobility of Ireland had appointed that the land, the persons and the property of the 'oilavs' should enjoy security and protection; for when the native Irish and the foreigners would be contending with each other, they should not cause trouble or annoyance to the professors, or to the pupils who were with them for instruction, hindering them from cultivating the arts. It is read in Julius Caesar, in the sixth book of his history, that the 'druids' who came from the west of Europe to direct schools in France enjoyed a similar immunity, and I think that it was from Ireland they brought that custom with them." (Ibid, p. 71.)

III.

To-day, there is something pathetic in the insistence of Keating that only those were fit to write the history of Ireland who knew the tongue in which its annals were written. The magnificent and equal justice of modern science has called before its bar and condemned all writers who dare to meddle with the facts of history without sufficient understanding of the original dress in which these facts were clothed, which dress is usually like the original atmosphere, the sunlight, in which the events took place, and therefore itself a superior medium of intelligence and judgment.¹⁸ Let it be

¹⁷ Habent hi magnates suos iuridicos, quos vocant Brehonos, suos historicos, qui res gestas describunt, medicos, poetas, quos bardos vocant, et citharædos, quibus singulis sua prædia assignata sunt, et singuli sunt in unoquoque territorio, et e certis et singulis familiis; scilicet, brehoni unius stirpis et nominis, historici alterius, et sic de coeteris, qui suos liberos sive cognatos in sua qualibet arte erudiunt, et semper successores habent. Cf. Lawrence Ginnell, *The Brehon Laws*, London (Fisher Unwin), 1894.

¹⁸ To Irish writers of the period in question, the English contempt for the original sources of Irish history was all the more aggravating by reason of the peculiar personal reverence for the primitive annalists and historians of Ireland—for the most part, venerable clerics, monks, missionaries and bishops.

"The historians and synchronisms of Erin were written and tested in the

recalled that when Keating wrote, the nation of Ireland in its entirety yet spoke Irish, and that the contemptuous ignoring of the rich and beloved national literature was all the more keenly felt. Alas! it was not truth but victory that was then being sought, not the larger knowledge but broader possessions, not an enrichment of the mind, but the extermination of an old and meritorious Christian race that had been for centuries schoolmaster to them who were now its despoilers and executioners.

"The refutation of these new foreign writers need not be pursued by us any further, although there are many things they insert in their histories which it would be possible to confute; because, as to the most part of what they write disparagingly of Ireland, they have no authority for writing it but repeating the tales of false witnesses who were hostile to Ireland, and ignorant of her history: for it is certain that the learned men who were conversant with antiquity in Ireland did not undertake to enlighten them in it, and, so, it was not possible for them to have knowledge of the history and the ancient state of Ireland. And Cambrensis, who undertook to supply warrant for everything, it is like in his case that it was a blind man or a blockhead who gave him such a shower of fabulous information so that he has left the invasion of the Tuatha De Danann without making mention of it, although they were three years short of two hundred in the headship of Ireland, and that there were nine kings of them in the sovereignty of Ireland: and (yet) he had recounted the first invasions of Ireland, although it were only the invasion of Ceasair, and that the antiquaries do not regard it for certain as an invasion, notwithstanding that it is mentioned by them in their books. Truly I think that he took no interest in investigating the antiquity of Ireland, but that the reason why

presence of those illustrious saints as is manifest in the great books that are named after the saints themselves and from their great churches; for there was not an illustrious church in Erin that has not a great book of history named from it or from the saints who sanctified it. It would be easy, too, to know from the books which the saints wrote, and the songs of praise which they composed in Irish that they themselves and their churches were the centres of the true knowledge, and the archives and homes of the manuscripts of the authors of Erin in the elder times. But alas! short was the time until dispersion and decay overtook the churches of the saints; their relics and their books; for there is not to be found of them now (1631) but a small remnant that has not been carried away into distant countries and foreign nations—carried away so that their fate is unknown from that time unto this." Michael O'Clery, *Preface to Book of Invasions*, written in 1631.

"It is absolutely necessary to study the poets of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, if one would come to a right understanding of the great transformation scene then being enacted. The feelings, aspirations, and politics of the Irish themselves are faithfully reflected in them, and though no Irish historian, except perhaps O'Halloran, has ever read them, yet no historian can afford to utterly neglect them. It has become common of late years to deny that there was any real national struggle of Ireland against England in the seventeenth century, and my friend Mr. Standish O'Grady, in particular, from a perusal of the English State Papers and other documents, has striven with eloquence and brilliancy to prove that the fight was a social and an economic one, a conflict between the smaller gentry and the great upper lords. But such a view of the case is greatly contracted (indeed, absolutely disproved) by a study of the Irish bards. The names of Erin, Banba, Fodhla, the Plain of Conn, the Land of the Children of Ir and Eber, are in their mouths at every moment, and to the very last they persisted in their efforts to combine the Gael against the Gail." Douglas Hyde, *op. cit.*, p. 525.

he set about writing of Ireland is to give false testimony concerning her people during his own time, and their ancestors before them: and, besides, it was but brief opportunity he had for research on the history of Ireland, since he spent but a year and a half at it before going (back) to England; and his history not being finished (in that time), he left a half year's portion wanting to be completed of it under the care of a companion of his, named Bertram Verdon.

"Wherefore, I hope that whatsoever impartial reader shall read every refutation which I make on Cambrensis, and on these new foreigners who follow his track, will trust the refutation I make on their lines rather than the story-telling they all do, for I am old, and a number of these were young; I have seen and I understand the chief historical books, and they did not see them, and if they had seen them, they would not have understood them. It is not for hatred nor for love of any set of people beyond another, nor at the instigation of any one, nor with the expectation of obtaining profit from it, that I set forth to write the history of Ireland, but because I deem it was not fitting that a country so honourable as Ireland, and races so noble as those who have inhabited it, should go into oblivion without mention or narration being left of them: and I think that my estimate in the account I give concerning the Irish ought the rather to be accepted, because it is of the Gaels I chiefly treat. Whoever thinks it much I say for them, it is not to be considered that I should deliver judgment through favour, giving them much praise beyond what they have deserved, being myself of the old Gaels as regards my origin." (Ibid, p. 76.)

It is with pardonable pride that Keating rehearses the right of an Irishman to be heard in the house of Clio. His reference to the "companies" of learned and holy Irishmen, who flooded the continent in earlier times no longer excites surprise. But the student of history is painfully affected when he hears the roll-call of many "illuminated books of Erin" that are no longer known. *Habent sua fata libelli*, but that of these valuable Irish miscellaneous manuscripts is, indeed, a sad one. They reached the O'Clerys and the Keatings, the disciples of Louvain and Salamanca, and then they fell a prey to that fate which loving hands had for so many centuries turned aside. Their "keepers" were exiled, impoverished; the lands confiscated that were once the endowments of these venerable books; the faith they illustrated, and in their fragments yet richly illustrate, was proscribed on the green hills and in the fertile vales that it had made famous throughout Christendom for ten centuries. The mild and humane philosophy they stood for was passing from the stage of human affairs, to make way for insatiable greed, license of desire, infinity of ambition. To the ecclesiastical historian—and the history of Ireland is hopelessly interwoven with that of the Church—this list of Keating, as quoted above, will be forever a root of sorrow. What problems did those books solve? What broken spaces of history did they bridge over? What errors of fact, appreciation, hypothesis, would they control and correct? What personalities would they light up, and what institutions would they outline more vividly? We repine in vain: the silent waters of Lethe have closed above their painted pages, and we now pursue rare and fitful echoes in fields where once moved a procession of witnesses.

If, indeed, it be that the soil is commended by every historian who writes on Ireland, the race is dispraised by every new foreign historian who writes about it, and it is by that I was incited to write this history concerning the

Irish, owing to the extent of the pity I felt at the manifest injustice which is done to them by those writers. If only indeed they had given their proper estimate to the Irish, I know not why they should not put them in comparison with any nation in Europe in three things, namely, in valour, in learning, and in being steadfast in the Catholic faith: and forasmuch as regards the saints of Ireland, it needs not to boast what a multitude they were, because the foreign authors of Europe admit this, and they state that Ireland was more prolific in saints than any country in Europe; and, moreover, they admit that the dominion of learning in Ireland was so productive, that she sent forth from her learned companies to France, to Italy, to Germany, to Flanders, to England, and to Scotland, as is clear from the introduction to the book in which were written in English lives of Patrick, Columcille, and Brigit; and forasmuch as concerns the ancient history of Ireland, it may be assumed that it was authoritative, because it used to be revised at the assembly of Tara every third year, in presence of the nobility, the clergy, and the learned of Ireland; and since the Irish received the faith, it has been placed under the sanction of the prelates of the Church. These chief books following which are still to be seen, will testify to this; namely, the Book of Armagh; the 'Saltair' of Cashel, which holy Cormac, son of Culleannan, king of the two provinces of Munster and archbishop of Cashel, wrote; the Book of Uachongbhall; the Book of Cluainneach of Fionntan in Leix; the 'Saltair na rann,' which Aonghus the 'Culdee' wrote; the Book of Glendaloch; the Book of Rights, which holy Benen, son of Seaghen wrote; the 'Uldhr' of Claran, which was written in Clonmacnois; the Yellow Book of Moling and the Black Book of Molaga. Here follows a summary of the books which were written in those, namely, the book of Invasion, the book of the Provinces, the Roll of Kings, the book of tribes, the book of synchronism, the book of famous places, the book of remarkable women, the book which was called 'Cólir anmann;' the book which was called 'Uralcheapt,' which Ceannfaolaidh the learned wrote, and the book which is called 'Amhra' of Columcille, which Dallan Forgaill wrote shortly after the death of Columcille. There are yet to be seen in Ireland many other histories, besides the chief books which we have mentioned, in which there is much of ancient record to be discovered, such as the battle of Magh Muccraimhe, the siege of Drulm Damhghaire, the fates of the knights, the battle of Crionna, the battle of Fionnchoradh, the battle of Ros-na-Ríogh, the battle of Magh Leana, the battle of Magh Rath, the battle of Magh Tualaing, and many other histories which we shall not mention here. Furthermore, the historical record of Ireland should be considered as authoritative, the rather that there were over two hundred professors of history keeping the ancient record of Ireland, and every one of them having a subsidy from the nobles of Ireland on that account, and having the revision of the nobility and clergy from time to time. Because of its antiquity, likewise, it is the more worthy of trust, and, also, that it has not suffered interruption or suppression from the violence of strangers. For, notwithstanding that the Norsemen had been troubling Ireland for a period, there were such a number of learned men keeping the ancient record that the historical compilation was preserved, even though many books fell into the hands of the Norsemen. Howbeit, it is not thus with other European countries, because the Romans, Gauls, Goths, Vandals, Saxons, Saracens, Moors, and Danes destroyed their old records in every Inroad (of their kings) which they made upon them: yet, it fell not to any of these to plunder Ireland, according to Cambrensis, in the forty-sixth chapter, where he says, speaking of Ireland: 'Ireland was, from the beginning, free from incursion of any foreign nation.' From this it may be understood that Ireland was free from the invasion of enemies by which her ancient history and her former transactions would be extinguished; and it is not so with any other country in Europe. Wherefore I think that it is more fitting to rely on the history of Ireland than on the history of any other country in Europe, and, moreover, as it has been expurgated by Patrick, and by the holy clergy of Ireland, from time to time." (Ibid, p. 77.)

The pages of Keating are constantly diversified by quaint verses, sententious and compact, quoted from very old poems. He forestalls the objection that they might arouse by insisting on their antiquity, and on the official character they acquired through the public revision of these ancient narratives that took place triennially at Tara. Once locked in metrical forms, it was harder to tamper

with their content. In addition, the versified stories were easier to retain, and as a rule, they had the charm of archaic words and phrases that acted like miniatures or echoes of the remote past. The Four Masters, too, abound in these quatrains and place in them an absolute confidence. The "Four Ancient Books of Wales" present an image of what such metrical chronicles looked like; similarly, the curious old Irish poem on "The Voyage of Brann, the Son of Febal," edited by Kuno Meyer.

"If any one should charge it upon me as a strange thing wherefore I give many verses as evidence for the history out of the old record, my answer to him is that my reason for that is, that the authors of the ancient record framed the entire historical compilation in poems, in order that thereby the less change should be made in the record; and also, that in this manner, it might the more be committed to memory by the students who were attending them: for it is through being verse metre the 'saltair' of Tara was called to the chief book which was in the custody of the king of Ireland's own professors, and the 'saltair' of Cashel to the chronicle of Cormac, son of Cuileannan, and the 'saltair' of the verses to the record of Aonghus the 'culdee': for, as 'psalm' and 'duan' (poem) or 'dan' (song) are alike, equal are 'saltair' or 'psalterium' and 'duanaire' in which there would be many poems or songs: and forasmuch as in the poems are the bone and marrow of the ancient record, I think that it is expedient for me to rely on it as authority in treating of the history. Therefore, I have often said, in opposing the authors who have been refuted by us, that the ancient record was against them, because I considered that the record which was common and had been frequently revised, has more of authority, as we have said, than any one solitary author of those who are in the history." (Ibid, p. 91.)

IV.

Keating was by no means an exceptional scholarly figure among the Irish of the first part of the seventeenth century. Indeed, some of his contemporaries rather underrated the writer's abilities.¹⁹ The

¹⁹ Fr. Turner, parish priest of Wexford, writing in 1631 to Luke Wadding at Rome, says: "One Father Keating laboreth much, as I hear say, in compiling Irish notes towards a history in Irish. Ye man is very studious, and yet I fear if his worke ever come to light, it will need an amendment of ill-warranted narrations. He could help you to many curiosities of which you can make better use than himself. I have no interest in ye man, for he dwelleth in Mounster." Meehan, op. cit., p. 306.

"Colgan and Keating, both of them Irish priests, have been unmercifully dealt with by our writers of the last two hundred years, on the very unfounded assumption that both these truly learned men believed themselves everything which appears in their writings. This can scarcely be called a fair proceeding, when we remember that Keating never professed to do more than abstract without comment what he found before him in the old books; and that Colgan had not promised or undertaken to give a critically digested History of the Lives of the Irish Saints at all. In fact, Colgan, like Keating, simply undertook to publish through the more accessible medium of the Latin language, the ancient lives just as he found them in the Gaedhlic. And it would be more becoming those who have drawn largely and often exclusively on the writings of these two eminent men, and who will continue to draw on them, to endeavor to imitate their devoted industry and scholarship, than to attempt to elevate themselves to a higher position of literary fame by a display of critical pedantry and what they suppose to be independence of opinion, in scoffing at the presumed credulity of those whose labors have laid in modern times the very groundwork of Irish history. O'Curry, op. cit., p. 341.

names of Luke Wadding, Michael O'Clery, Patrick Fleming, Hugh Ward, Bonaventure Baron, Thomas Messingham, come before us as representatives of that laborious historical research which necessarily precedes all critical narrative or philosophical exposition of the facts of history. Indefatigable collectors of historical materials were the Franciscans, habitual chroniclers of many chieftains and ancient houses. Fr. Meehan has admirably paraphrased their spirit and their method in the account he gives of the accurate and pathetic description made in 1608 by Fr. Mooney of the status of the principal Franciscan establishments then flourishing in Ireland.

The literary glories of the whole order were very dear to its Irish members, since Luke Wadding found time, amid his many distracting occupations, to compile the classical "Annals of the Friars Minor" in eight large folios, a yet indispensable work to the general historian.²⁰ At the same time Fr. Michael O'Clery was travelling through Ireland from one monastic house to another, collecting for Fr. Hugh Ward at Louvain the materials for a complete collection of the lives of the Irish Saints.²¹ His work was carried on "amid the ever-thickening political shocks of that most destructive age." His excellent transcripts of old sources were regularly remitted to Hugh Ward (Mac an Bháird) but the latter died before he could begin the "*Acta Sanctorum Hiberniae*" that he had planned. O'Clery was a trained antiquary before he joined the Franciscans; he belonged to a family of traditional historians, and so was well equipped to recognize the value of all the manuscripts that passed under his eyes, whether ecclesiastical or secular, prose or poetical. Almost as a recreation he compiled from them two works known as the *Réim Rioghraidhe* or "Succession of Kings in Ireland" and the *Leabhar Gabhala* or "Book of Invasions." The former brings down to 1022 the genealogy of the Irish Kings from the earliest times; the latter gives an account of the colonizations of Ireland down to

²⁰ *Annales Minorum, seu trium Ordinum a Sancto Francesco institutorum auctore A. R. P. Luca Wadingo Hiberno, Sacrae Theologiae Jubilato Lectore et Ordinis Chronologo.* Lugduni, 7 vols. fol. 1625-1648. An eighth volume was printed at Rome in 1654. A second edition was begun at Rome in sixteen folio volumes in 1731, and continued at various intervals. The twenty-fifth folio volume was printed at Quaracchi in 1887. Fr. Francis Harold, author of a life of Fr. Wadding, published in Latin some excerpts of the work, (Rome, 2 vols., fol. 1662). Fr. Marcellino da Clivezza, the illustrious historian of the Franciscan missions, calls Wadding "*una figura gigantesca nell' ordine sotto ogni rispetto e pochi sono che lo conoscano.*" *Bibliografia Sanfrancescana.* Prato, 1879, p. 640.

²¹ Cf. Irish Theologians of the Seventeenth Century, *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* (III. Series), I, 277-286, and de Buck, *L'Archéologie Irlandaise au Couvent de St. Antoine de Padoue à Louvain.* Paris, 1869. See Bellesheim, *Geschichte der kath. Kirche in Irland*, III., 686, sqq., and Hurter's *Nomenclator*, passim.

the same period. The material was entirely taken from the ancient books, many of them now lost, and conveniently arranged by the skilful hand of O'Clery. These labors helped still more to fit him for the task of "The Annals of Donegal" (Four Masters) that he completed between 1632 and 1634 with the aid of several antiquaries of his own family and at the expense of the high minded chieftain, Fergal O'Gara, Lord of Moy Gara and Coolavin. O'Clery is also the author of the famous work known as the "Catalogus Sanctorum Hiberniae" or Martyrology of Donegal. (Dublin, 1864.) Three attempts were made in the nineteenth century to print in their entirety the Annals of the Four Masters. The third publication bears the name of John O'Donovan as editor, and is rightly said to be the greatest work ever accomplished by any modern Irish scholar.²²

John Colgan took up the task that Michael O'Clery had collected for so zealously, and out of the materials that his friend had gathered began the "Acta Sanctorum Hiberniae." It never went beyond the first volume.²³ It was soon followed, however, by the famous collection of documents concerning Saints Patrick, Brigid, and Columbkille.²⁴ Colgan wrote also a life of his countryman Duns Scotus.²⁵

²² "As if to emphasize the truth that they were only redacting the Annals of Ireland from the most ancient sources at their command, the Masters wrote in an ancient bardic dialect full at once of such idioms and words as were unintelligible even to the men of their own day, unless they had received a bardic training. In fact they were learned men writing for the learned, and this work was one of the last efforts of the *esprit de corps* of the school-bred shanachy, which always prompted him to keep bardic and historical learning a close monopoly amongst his own class. Keating was Michael O'Clery's contemporary, but he wrote—and I consider him the first Irish historian and chronicler who did so—for the masses and not for the classes, and he had his reward in the thousands of copies of his popular History, made and read throughout all Ireland, while the copies made of the Annals were quite few in comparison, and after the end of the seventeenth century little read." Douglas Hyde, op. cit., p. 580.

On the curious discipline of the "Bardic Schools" that continued to exist in Ireland throughout the seventeenth century, see *ibid*, pp. 524-530.

²³ *Acta Sanctorum veteris et majoris Scotiae seu Hiberniae*, Lovanii, 1645. The value of some of these old vellums transcribed by O'Clery may be learned from the important texts made known in the *Codex Salmanticensis*, *Acta Sanctorum Hiberniae ex Codice Salmanticensi nunc primum integre*, edit. C. de Smedt, Bruxelles, 40, 1888. The Bollandist editors rightly call it "haud spernendum illud antiqui musaei Bollandiani cimelium."

²⁴ *Trias Thaumaturga, seu divorum Patricii, Columbae et Brigidae, trium Hiberniae sanctorum insulae communium patronorum Acta*, Lovanii, 1647, in two enormous folios. The work is still very valuable, and as rare as it is useful.

²⁵ *Tractatus de patria, vita, scriptis Johannis Scoti Doctoris Sublimis*. A copy of this rare work is in the Franciscan Monastery at Dublin. He left, moreover, nearly 3,000 manuscript pages, dealing with the lives and history of Irish saints and monks in England, Brittany, Gaul, Belgium, Lorraine, Burgundy, the Rhineland and Italy. These priceless haglographical treasures have been almost entirely lost. Douglas Hyde, op. cit., p. 577.

To the contemporary of Colgan, and his fellow-Franciscan, Fr. Patrick Fleming, we owe a work still in constant use by the historians of Ireland, political, ecclesiastical, and literary.²⁶ Patrick Fleming was a near relative, and a disciple of Thomas Fleming, son to the sixteenth baron of Slane, a family of the English Pale, that, with one exception, ever deserved well of the Irish Church. (Meehan op. cit. pp. 144-145). Our author was made guardian of the Irish Franciscan convent at Prague in 1631, and in the same year was murdered with the deacon Matthew Hoar at Beneschow in Bohemia by Calvinist peasants. In the same field of Irish hagiology worked Thomas Messingham, Rector of the Irish College in Paris. His work is still of service.²⁷ Messingham was in literary communication with the scholarly David Rothe, Bishop of Ossory, and Luke Wadding (Meehan, op. cit. p. 355). About the same time Fr. Henry Fitzsimons, S. J., had published an alphabetical catalogue of the principal saints of Ireland, with the sources of his information.²⁸ In this work, Fitzsimon makes use of the "Kalendarium" prepared by his fellow Jesuit, the learned Richard Fleming (1596), and the "Collectanea" of another learned Jesuit, Fr. Stephen White. From the "Kalendarium" was composed a Litany of Irish Saints that the exiled earls at Rome were wont to recite every day, at a fixed hour in company with Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Armagh. This distinguished divine was himself the author of a valuable work on Irish history.²⁹ Lately an unedited work of the same writer was discovered by the indefatigable Sir John Gilbert. It is dedicated to James I.³⁰

One of the most personal and interesting histories of the seventeenth century is the Latin work already quoted, in which the son of Donal O'Sullivan Beare, Chief of Dunboy, has related the vicissitudes of the ill-starred rebellion of Hugh O'Neill, Earl of Tyrone,

²⁶ *Collectanea Sacra, seu S. Columbae et aliorum sanctorum Acta et Opuscula*, Lovanii, 1667.

²⁷ *Florilegium Insulae Sanctorum, seu Vitae et Acta Sanctorum Hiberniae*, Paris, 1624, in folio.

²⁸ *Catalogus praecipuorum sanctorum Hiberniae, recognitus et auctus per R. P. Henricum Fitzsimons, S. J.*, Duaci, 1615, Leodii, 1619; and nine times after that: cf. Henry Fitzsimons, S. J., *Catholic Confutation to Mr. Rider's Claim to Antiquitie*, Rouen, 1668. *Britannomachia Ministrorum*, Duaci, 1614: *Words of Comfort to Persecuted Catholics, written in Exile*, 1607: *Letters from a Cell in Dublin Castle*, edited by Edm. Hogan, S. J., Dublin, 1881.

²⁹ *De Regno Hiberniae sanctorum insula commentarius*, 40, Lovanii, 1632, reprinted with prefatory memoir by Cardinal Moran, Dublin, 1868, from the original (Barberini) MS. at Rome.

³⁰ *Ad Jacobum I., Magnae Britanniae Franciae et Hiberniae Regem Maximum Basilicon Doron a Petro Lombard Archiepiscopo Armacano destinatum ac dictatum pro religione et patria*. This was in imitation, no doubt, of a famous similarly titled work of that king.

that ended with the defeat of Kinsale (1601) and the thrilling siege of Dunboy (1602) where of the one hundred and forty-three defenders "no one man escaped," says Sir George Carew, "but were either slain, executed, or buried in the ruins; and so obstinate and resolved a defense had not been seen within this kingdom."

The contemporary Irish episcopate was both learned and sympathetic to learning. In the midst of unspeakable trials, the Franciscan Thomas Fleming, Catholic Archbishop of Dublin (1623-1651) found time to encourage the historians of his native land.

"Passionately fond of the ancient literature of Ireland," says Fr. Meehan (op. cit., p. 147), "he generously entertained brother Michael O'Cleary in the Convent of Dublin, and it was under that poor roof that the chief of the Four Masters found bed and board while transcribing a goodly portion of the material which was subsequently incorporated in the *"Annals of Donegal."* To his brethren in Louvain, he extended the same patronage, and it is to his fostering care we are indebted for Colgan's *"Trias Thaumaturga,"* a fact gratefully acknowledged by the author (ib., p. 316) who states that the archbishop transmitted to him many a rare book and valuable record without which he could not have completed his noble work. These surely are evidences of an intellectual nobility which, in that transition period strove to maintain the honor of Ireland by preserving and perpetuating its ancient literature."

Cornelius O'Deveney, bishop of Down and Connor, cruelly martyred at Dublin in 1611 by the flinty Chichester, had been collecting for several years the records of the Irish bishops, clergy and laymen, whom Elizabeth had outlawed, exiled, or executed, for refusing the oath of supremacy. These fragmentary notices came into the hands of a man who was made for better times, fitted to be a genuine Maecenas of learning, and himself no mean scholar—David Rothe, born in 1573, bishop of Ossory from 1618 to 1650. This truly noble Irish ecclesiastic labored for many years at an antiquarian treatise entitled *"Hierographia Sacra Hiberniae."* It was a general ecclesiastical survey of Ireland, commencing with the history of Kilkenny and comprising notices of Irish saints, cathedrals, shrines, dioceses, places of pilgrimage, anchorets, early seats of learning, holy wells, rural deaneries—in a word a series of essays on Irish archæology, the great value of which is apparent from the few fragments that have been preserved by transcription. He also labored for fifty years at an Ecclesiastical History of Ireland from the earliest days to his own time. It is a great pity that these learned works, particularly the latter, though both ready for the press, should have been carried off or destroyed by the Cromwellian savages in the sack of Kilkenny (1650).

The notes of Bishop O'Deveney must have been seen through the press by Rothe before 1617, for in that year a second enlarged and annotated edition in three parts was printed—the whole bearing the title *"Analecta,"* and signed by T. W. Philadelphus.³¹ This en-

³¹ Rothe, *Analecta*, edited with an introduction by (Cardinal) Patrick F. Moran, Dublin, 1884.

larged edition of the "Index Martyrialis" is an admirable summary of fifty years of martyrdom in the Irish Church, and bears on every page an impress of the calm gravity and stern decision that characterized so many superior souls in that dread time. It is great indeed for a nation to know how to live, but how few nations know how to die! To this work Rothe added an appendix entitled "Disasphendon Hiberniae" or Dismemberment of Ireland, in reference to the two acts of parliament on the oath of supremacy and liturgical conformity. In 1620 there was printed at Paris a Latin rendering of a sermon of Rothe on St. Brigid which he had preached in that city in 1617 at the Irish College, being strongly urged thereto by a wealthy citizen and benefactor named Escalopier. It urges the students to make ready for martyrdom, and criticises severely Thomas Dempster, who had just undertaken to strip Ireland of her title of Island of Saints in favor of Scotland. In 1621, Rothe published at Rouen and Cologne, under the pseudonym of Donatus Roirk, a work entitled "Hibernia Resurgens" or "Preservation against the Bite of the Old Serpent." He rejects and exposes again the fallacies and plagiarisms of the fantastic Scotsman. Rothe also defended his "Analecta" against the hypocritical contentions of Sir Thomas Ryves and of Harris (Writers of Ireland) that the victims of Elizabeth and James were guilty of high treason and punished as such. This apology has been lost with the other writings of Rothe. He was a correspondent in matters of erudition with Ussher, who borrowed from him certain very old and valuable documents for his "Sylloge Epistolarum," not without acknowledging that they had been communicated to him by Rothe, "a most diligent investigator of his country's antiquities." Another work, "Samaritanus Praescribens Remedia Hiberniae," destined to reconcile the conflicting parties in the Assembly of Kilkenny was never printed, and has probably perished with so many of his writings.

Hugh O'Reilly (1580-1652) successively bishop of Kilmore and archbishop of Armagh, fully justified his princely origin by the encouragement he gave to Colgan in the publication of his "Acta Sanctorum Hiberniae." Out of his scant revenues, he furnished the means for the publication of the work, and deserved to see his name on the title-page.

"May we not imagine," says Fr. Meehan (p. 169), "with what complacency he perused those pages in which Colgan so elegantly alludes to his princely origin; the renown of his ancestors in ancient times; their prowess in the battlefield; their munificence to church and cloister; his own promotion to the see of Kilmore; his elevation to the primacy, and the hereditary valour of his kinsmen, who, worthy of their sires, were then in arms for their religion, king, and fatherland, a patent of intellectual nobility which no monarch could confer!"

It is to O'Reilly's credit that he tried, but without success, to

have the Gregorian calendar adopted in Ireland. He was the heart and soul of the confederation of Kilkenny. His kinsman, Owen O'Neill, was the general who, properly supported, might have won at least better terms for Ireland than were the wretched outcome of once bright hopes. During the war, his relative, Malmorra the Slasher, was slain near Granard. The clansmen carried him to Cavan, to the old Franciscan convent, and there raised a monument bearing these words at once sad and proud:

Lector, ne credas solum perisse Milonem,
Ecce nam sub tumulo patria victa jacet.

These were not the only learned Irish bishops of that day. Nicholas French, bishop of Ferns, wrote a work on the Irish history of his own times.³² Thomas Dease (1568-1651), bishop of Meath, descendant of an ancient and wealthy family, was a good poet in the Irish tongue, and a master of classical literature. Like most Irishmen of the time, he had received his education abroad, but not before imbibing much learning from the ancestral sources.³³ Occasionally, as in the case of Hugh MacCaghwell, Archbishop of Armagh, who died at Rome in 1626, they received an early education in the Isle of Man, with which the Irish at all times kept up close and friendly communication.³⁴

The figure of Peter Lombard (1554-1625) archbishop of Armagh since 1601, is one of the most attractive in the Roman Curia of the early part of the seventeenth century. Lombard was, in his time, the most brilliant of the young Irish students at Louvain, where he attracted the attention of the Holy See as a "youth of great promise." He lived at Rome under five Popes, and took a lively part in the labors of the famous Congregation, "*De Auxiliis*," called to settle

³² *The Bleeding Iphigenia, or Sale and Settlement of Ireland, 1649.* Cf. *The Historical Works of Nicholas French*, now for the first time collected, vol. I., *Settlement of Ireland*; vol. II., *The Unkind Deserter*, Dublin, 1840.

³³ Cf. Meehan, *The Rise and Fall of the Irish Franciscan Monasteries and Memoirs of the Irish Hierarchy in the seventeenth century*, with appendix containing numerous original documents, Dublin, 1872.

³⁴ Hugh MacCaghwell was born at Saul, county of Down, about the year 1571. His parents were poor, but, their poverty notwithstanding, they did all in their power to advance his early education, and when the boy grew up he went to the Isle of Man, and remained there many years, devoting himself to the study of classics and dialectics till he was recalled to Ireland by Hugh, prince of Tyrone, and who took him into his household, and appointed him tutor to his sons Henry and Hugh." Meehan, *op. cit.*, p. 157. MacCaghwell became a Franciscan at Salamanca, lector on theology at that university, and later one of the original founders of St. Anthony's College at Louvain, and at Rome of St. Isidore's, likewise for brethren of his order. With Luke Wadding he obtained from Urban VIII. the approval of an Irish College at Rome for diocesan priests, and from Cardinal Ludovisi the funds for the building and endowment. MacCaghwell was a valiant Scotist. Besides many volumes of theology he wrote (1620) a *Life of Scotus*.

certain theological questions at issue between the Jesuits and the Dominicans. Though Lombard never returned to Ireland as archbishop of Armagh, he served his country well as the Roman agent of Tyrone. He has left us the above-mentioned important history of the affairs of Ireland in his own time. It deals especially with the vicissitudes of the great Northern earls. It was looked upon by the English as a "dangerous book," and its sale and circulation suppressed.

Scarcely less distinguished than Peter Lombard was his contemporary, the Franciscan Florence O'Conry (Flathry O'Moelchonery). Disciple of Baius at Louvain and friend of Jansenius, he had arrived at the theological conclusions of the latter by an independent study of the writings of St. Augustine. His own writings were highly esteemed by the Jansenists.³⁵

The family of St. Dominic was never without superior and scholarly representatives in Ireland.³⁶ Roche MacGeoghegan (1580-1640) was educated at Lisbon and Salamanca, and held the see of Kildare from 1629 to 1640. He had collected a vast library, but was obliged to pledge a great portion of it to relieve his suffering flock. MacGeoghegan died at Kilbeggan, whither he had gone to consult the famous physician, Owen O'Shiel, the "Eagle of Irish Doctors."³⁷

³⁵ Peregrinus Jerichontinus, Paris, 1641, with an introduction and dedication to Urban VIII., who had consecrated O'Conry. O'Conry published also an Irish Catechism at Louvain in 1625 under the title "Mirror of a Christian Life." This Catechism, like that of O'Hussey (Louvain, 1608) and Stapleton (Brussels, 1639) and some others was meant for the benefit of the Irish troops serving in the Netherlands. What such troopers were like may be seen from the curious drawing of Albert Durer. "Albert Durer had seen the Irish soldiers in the Low Countries and he drew a sketch of five of them which is still preserved at Vienna. They are fine, powerfully built, and formidable looking fellows, armed with the long sword and the gallow-glass axe, clad in a mantle of Irish rug, and wearing the Irish glib and moustache, which it was forbidden to wear at home under pain of forfeiture, not only of the glib and moustache, but even of the head. The great artist wrote over the drawing: "Here go the war-men of Ireland!" Hogan's Distinguished Irishmen of the Seventeenth Century, pp. 115-116. The poet Spenser could not but voice the universal opinion of the bravery of the Irish soldiers in foreign service. "I have heard some great warriors say that in all the services they had seen abroad they never saw a more comely man than the Irishman, nor that cometh on more bravely in his charge." Op. cit., p. 416.

³⁶ Cf. Thomas de Burgo, *Hibernia Dominioana*, Co loniae, 1762.

³⁷ On the skill of contemporary Irish physicians in general, and in particular O'Shiel cf. the curious and interesting summary of an ancient manuscript memoir in Fr. Meehan, op. cit., pp. 373-390. At the same time, Neal O'Glacan, a native of Donegal, was professor of medicine successively in the Universities of Toulouse and Bologna, and afterwards physician to the King of France. To the same period belongs Bernard O'Connor, the physician of John Sobieski at the siege of Vienna (1683) and afterwards professor of medicine at Oxford. Cf. Dictionary of National Biography s. v.

The traditional genius of Ireland was therefore recognized in continental Europe throughout the seventeenth century. In theology, philosophy, history, administration, the arts of peace and war, the unhappy exiles won renown—beside the few whose names are famous we must imagine a nameless multitude whose modesty or circumstances forbade the transmission of their learning to posterity. The literary histories of the great religious orders, and of Belgium, Spain and France, are rich with the records of such lives consumed in study and teaching.

For this reason it is all the more to be regretted that so ardent and studious a race should have been compelled to quit its immemorial stronghold and seek abroad the larger learning it was denied at home. Ireland might well have had many and superior Keatings. By traditions and temperament she was called to furnish pioneers in the science of history, writers who would have enriched the native tongue with the best thought of other lands, while affording it new fields of exercise and multitudinous points of contact with all the new forces then disengaging themselves from the mediæval past to mould the future of humanity. The land, small and everywhere accessible, was itself a rare mirror of the past, pagan and Christian. Its numerous monuments of architecture were both peculiar and instructive, and sheltered a multitude of historical materials—church plate and furnishings, reliquaries, relics, sepulchres, inscriptions.

On all sides were families devoted to special branches of learning and jealous to preserve the oldest records of the same. Each chieftain had a living interest in, a daily need of, the local genealogies, with which went habitually the memories of the past, local reminiscences and local coloring in which events and institutions are enshrined as flies in ambergris. The spoken tongue of the people was itself a venerable museum of history, replete with intelligence and explanation of the past. Manuscripts abounded, some of them almost coeval with the conversion of the race.

It was a period of transition, and the new learning that had conquered its right to existence on the Continent might well have furnished the Irish genius a very suitable field for its bent toward literary erudition and the veneration of the manners and monuments of the past. Some of the best gifts of the historian were native to the Irish scribe or investigator—extensive research, exact intelligence, candor of speech. In the mediæval universities the Irish had long enjoyed their full share of glory—one of the two great schools of rational theology was called the Irish (Scotist) school. The native fondness for mathematics and chronology might well have led the way to critical and exact research—what the native schools could produce in the way of erudite toil was shown in the persons of

Luke Wadding and John Colgan. Indeed, it would seem that in the ordinary course of Divine Providence the Irish Franciscans were called to create a domestic school of history no less famous than the Benedictine school in contemporary seventeenth century France.

It is at once pathetic and significant that the last national historians of Gaelic Ireland should have written in the native tongue—one in the select academic speech of scholars, the other in the everyday language of the people, one in an interminable voluminous record enshrining the chief traits of a national life that was fast ebbing, the other in a compendium destined to bear across the eighteenth century a popular conception of the past of Ireland that might be incorrect in details, but was otherwise portraitesque in its veracity. Keating, in particular, rendered the Irish people a service for which they can never be grateful enough—he placed in their hands a résumé of the past at once clear, brief, lively, intelligible. What the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle did for the English consciousness his history did for the Irish. He was more to his people than Geoffrey of Monmouth or Henry of Huntingdon or Florence of Worcester had ever been to England; for these monastic chroniclers wrote in the lettered ease of cloisters, while the persecuted Irish cleric wrote his story amid alarms and flights and wanderings—a circumstance that endeared to every reader this catechism of the Irish past and raised it to the dignity of a Book of Martyrs. Soon the night of penal legislation falls upon a people that had already borne more than a century of intermittent conflict. No longer does a stronghold of O'Neill or O'Donnell welcome the historian and his parchments; only the traveling harper and the Jacobite bard continue to nourish the fires of patriotism with impassioned music and symbolic songs. The hospitable hearths of ancient abbeys are quenched and their storied and painted vellums scattered or destroyed. With Julian malice and more than Julian fortune a Time of Ignorance was created for the "Island of Saints and Schoolmasters"—the dreary intellectual horror of the eighteenth century. That the doomed race did not utterly forget the rock from which it was hewn, nor the hole of the pit from whence it was dug, was certainly owing to the wide diffusion of Keating's masterly book. Its very defects, as we moderns reckon, were its chief qualities in the eyes of men who had accepted a philosophy of calm despair, and found their only relief in the romantic contemplation of a glorious past, sole remnant of an immemorial independence, pride and greatness.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

THE POPULAR PLAY.

THE task of presenting an accurate picture of present dramatic conditions is neither easy nor inviting. Precise data cannot be found easily, and prejudice against the stage is as active as it is inconsistent and ill-informed. Whether one treats the subject as a popular amusement, somewhat regulated by law, and very much regulated by public opinion; or discusses it as a branch of the literary art; or approaches it from the purely commercial and utilitarian side: there is sure to be misunderstanding unless the writer's tone be one of disparagement. Thirty years ago the misinformed denounced the novel pretty much as they denounce the stage to-day. The novel and the stage survive, and have increased in influence, not because the denunciations of the fathers lacked something of justification, but because both stage and novel are social and literary facts that have been from the beginning and will be to the end. Denunciation should be directed at the abuses of power, and not at the power itself, unless it also be evil.

Official opinion of the stage is curiously at variance with popular and individual sentiment. There is a class of ministers who make it part of their regular duty to criticize the passing show. Their criticism, usually adverse, and directed at the particular drama just then amusing naughty audiences, has for principle: from one learn all. Occasionally the more loose-tongued of this class laud the stage to the skies, and pronounce its general influence superior to that of the Protestant pulpit. In Catholic journals the stage is almost ignored, or coldly mentioned in passing criticism; while editorially the tone is always denunciatory. The more remote the journal from the city the more bitter the denunciation is likely to prove. The non-Catholic clergy as a body cherish a distrust of the stage, are quite convinced of its traditional depravity, and detest it perhaps even more than they detest the saloon. Our priesthood is a divided body on the question, with an official majority, however, against the stage. The professional critics of the drama, strangely enough, are not always its friends, and hedge in their favor with so thick a briar that one may count them on either side. On the whole it may safely be said that distrust of the stage is a commoner sentiment with our natural and official heads than any other. They respect the ban which many traditions in as many countries long ago put upon the stage and the player.

On the other hand no fact stands out more clearly in our day than the popularity of the stage and the player from every point of view. With the multitude the player is now a person of distinction, and

even the children gather about the stage-door after a matinee to see their hero in the familiar light of day. The theatres are multiplying in the larger cities, capital has been attracted to the investment of amusing the people, and the road companies, the old-time barn-stormers, are meeting with greater encouragement every year. The successful dramatist easily makes a fortune. Very often we hear the story of the popular novelist deserting the novel for the lighter and better-paid work of the dramatist. Oftener still we see the stage-hater converted into the inveterate playgoer. It would be difficult to name a popular amusement which brings more patrons to its halls, more profit to its promoters, and greater honor to its actors and playwrights. It may be said of Catholics in this country that, as a body, they have a high regard for the stage. Actors themselves recognize this trait in them. A few Catholic journals have therefore ventured to discuss the stage regularly and to give a brief chronicle of the passing play, a thing which so great a journal as *Le Correspondant* of Paris has been doing for the last twenty years. Nevertheless, side by side with this popular patronage of the stage runs the official distrust and denunciation.

This difference between the utterances of authority and the conduct of the crowd has not yet been explained, but may easily be accounted for, since it springs from a confusion of ideas. "The stage" is a phrase that covers large ground, and embraces many things beside the drama, which has now become only a single department in the grand scheme of public entertainment. On the stage are produced grand opera, comic and light opera, spectacle, musical farce, the so-called farce-comedy, and vaudeville. These forms of entertainment belong to "the stage," but they are not the drama. However closely they may imitate the play, they are not plays. With the exception of grand opera these forms of amusement are flexible, admit of anything in the shape of diversion from a stereopticon lecture on Spain to a dog circus, and serve easily as a vehicle for whatever will suit the taste of an audience. They may be clean or obscene, nice or vulgar, coarse or refined. All depends upon the manager, custom allows them a wide margin with regard to the etiquette of morality, and audiences are usually indifferent to the moral worth of their actors. A minister sees one of these entertainments, and at once delivers a denunciation of the stage in general; a clean soul gapes horrified at the vulgarity of a musical farce, or farce-comedy, and ever after looks upon the stage with disgust. On the other hand the better class of stage entertainments and the regular drama are on the whole decent and sober in presentation, and attract rather than repel their patrons, who are pleased and edified beyond expectation. They see and hear nothing

worthy of condemnation, and the clean play becomes a part of their regular recreation.

In other words the stage is one thing and the drama another. The two have been confused, and included in the same denunciation. The stage entertainment outside the drama is a commercial affair like the circus, not a matter of literature and art; a mixture of the good and the bad like the saloon, the popular picnic-ground, or the seaside resort. One must exercise ordinary discretion in selecting his stage entertainment as in other things. The drama is the original stage entertainment, coeval with man, I must believe, in spite of the records, or the lack of them; since it is as natural for man to act a story as to tell it. The play tells a story, and in our day hangs the story upon the peg of a love-theme. This is a convention so absolute that no dramatist can dispense with it, unless he is willing to dispense, like Ibsen, with audiences. The convention is no hardship. There is not such a surplus of true love on earth as to make its conventional and necessary presence a hindrance to a play. On the other hand the stage entertainment has few conventions, its chief duty and necessity being to amuse the audience at any cost. Therefore the grand opera occasionally descends to ballet spectacle, the comic opera may present a vaudeville performance or a mock circus between its legitimate sections, and the other forms of entertainment endeavor to surprise with novelties most incongruous.

These details make clear and pertinent the fact that the stage and the drama are not the same thing, and that wholesale and sweeping denunciation does not exactly fit the circumstances. The experienced audience understands very well the gaps in the information supplied to the average denouncer; the experienced reader can measure to a fraction the ignorance of the editor who on occasions shakes his rhetorical fist at the latest news of the stage. I have before me at the present moment a list of entertainments at the forty-two theatres of New York city for the last week of February this year. They diverted their patrons with one grand opera, four burlesques, seven vaudeville shows, ten comic-operas so-called, and twenty dramas. The critics and reviewers are authority for the statement that all but one of the vaudeville shows were clean in fact and intention, that the comic operas and the burlesques were too inane for the most part to be more than vulgar or commonplace, that fifteen of the dramas were beyond reproach, four were morally clean but not to be witnessed by children, and one was somewhat nasty in intention, though not so in expression. This is certainly a favorable analysis, though it must be remembered that the critics are metropolitan. The judgment of the rural moralists might be

more severe, for the reason that New Yorkers have grown used to certain conventionalities of the stage, which shock the inexperienced by their suggestiveness. In the city they no longer have any meaning; in the country they look as audacious as the Apollo Belvedere in a district schoolhouse. Nevertheless with due allowance for the degrees of sensitiveness in the urban and rural populations, the absence of dirt and offensiveness in thirty-two out of forty-two entertainments is worthy of note; and the percentage of cleanness is large enough to demand a finer discrimination in the common denunciation of the stage.

However, this article is not concerned with the stage, but with the drama; and with that form of it indicated by the title, the popular play, as opposed to the productions of Ibsen and other experimentalists; and again with the English-speaking stage and the present time, which includes the nineteenth century. These limitations are necessary both by the nature of the subject, and by the necessity of defense against the slap-dash editor, the hasty reader, the moral critic, and the pious souls, to whom the very mention of the drama is offensive and even sinful. I am not defending the stage, nor that department of it devoted to the drama. The intention is merely to place before readers some facts once known but long forgotten, with others that have been overlooked; in order to secure at least a suspension of judgment, and a re-examination of an untenable position. In many things our methods do not compare favorably with the striking methods of our fathers in dealing with the questions of the hour. Thus, in the history of modern drama we are told that St. Gregory Nazianzen banished immoral plays from the theatre and staged his own compositions on the lives of the saints and the martyrs; that these sacred dramas were introduced into the convents and monasteries of the East, and later of the West; that ecclesiastics were the actors, and that a layman would as soon thought of saying Mass as of taking a part in these dramas. As we all know these sacred plays led in England to the public miracle play, which was the source of the modern melodrama. The straightforward manner of dealing with a problem in the days of St. Gregory accounts perhaps for the success of Christianity on the human side in those perilous times, when a priest was as ready to play the martyr in a sacred drama, for the pious entertainment of the people, as to face the beasts in the arena or starvation in the desert.

The aim of the modern play is to present a story of human life as nearly like the real thing as possible. With well-trained actors, who can disguise themselves perfectly with the assumed character, and with a stage whose mechanical powers enable it to produce the most

marvelous illusions, the modern playwright finds it easy to impress his audience properly. It is a fact to be taken into account, in measuring the influence of the modern drama, that the average playgoer surrenders himself entirely to the illusion produced by a well-managed stage. The critics, the first-nighters, and the habitués of the theatre have lost this power of self-surrender. They enjoy no illusion. Their pleasure springs from study of the actors and the play, and a comparison of actors and playwright with themselves or rivals in the same domain. This fact will explain one phenomenon in dramatic affairs: the unexpected popularity of a play which the critics to a man have condemned. The critics take one standpoint, and the public takes another. A popular play is a valuable piece of property, but its value largely depends on its power to please audiences as far apart as Montreal and New Orleans. It must travel far and long, and face very different audiences. Therefore the effort to make it universally pleasing is very great. Whether it be high or low comedy, melodrama for Broadway or the cheaper theatres, tragedy of the finer or coarser fibre, it must be written for the varied American audience.

These facts are mentioned because they have added much to the rigidity of stage conventions. These conventions of the drama are formalities to be observed by every dramatist in building up a play. Without them no play can secure presentation. The love-theme, for example, is the most absolute convention of the modern stage. A tendency to greater strictness in observing these conventions has come with the increased chances of financial success. Playwrights complain in consequence, but the managers are obdurate, and will rarely attempt innovations. A study of the more important of these conventions is now in order, and will prove very instructive. They may be summed up in the general statement that the popular play cannot offend the first principles of Christian faith and Christian morality. In order to get at the precise significance of this statement it will be necessary to go into details. In the first place playgoers know that the average play is usually concerned with the triumph of justice and right over their opposites. The hero and heroine after a struggle against odds win peace, wealth, and honor by overcoming the villain, and then get married. Love, sacrifice, and the triumph of virtue are the conventional themes of the popular play, and no dramatist can work without them. Pessimistic realism so far has failed to get a footing in the play. The triumph of the right is the chief convention of the popular play.

The second presupposes the existence and the providence of God. No dramatist in America or England could secure presentation for a drama that denied the existence and providence of God, or implied

a general disbelief in these doctrines. The play must be built upon lines that will not contravene them; and the oftener they are used for the critical and emotional moments of the drama the more pleased will be the average audience. The richest lines to an actor, the most effective with his hearers, are those which call upon the Deity to interfere in behalf of the oppressed, and to crush the oppressor; or which leave to God the care of the wronged and the avenging of their injuries. A curious example of this convention was provided recently in a melodrama built out of three popular poems of John Hay, the present Secretary of State, and entitled *Jim Bludso*. The leading character was an engineer on the Mississippi, who held the bow of a burning steamer against the bank of the river while the passengers got ashore. His bravery cost him his life. Jim is represented as a typical citizen of Pike county, Missouri, with no religion and few beliefs beyond that of God's existence. In His providence he does not believe, on the ground that man is too small a creature for the Infinite to notice; a heresy sharply rebuked by the minister in the play. The time will come, says the minister, when affliction will make clear to you that God must help us in miseries beyond the power of man to soothe or remove; then you will get on your knees willing enough, and with faith enough in God's goodness to win the answer to your prayer. The playwright contrives that such a moment shall come for Jim. The overflowing river carries away his wife, his boy, and his faithful servant, and the villain has a rope about Jim's neck ready for his hanging; it is a desperate moment, and Jim falls on his knees confessing the need of God's help and his faith in the Divine interference; in answer to his prayer for the safety of his boy at least a boat rides triumphantly in bearing the boy to his father's arms. This may be classed as an extreme example of the use of a stage convention, but it illustrates the fact aptly. At the very least the playwright must respect the doctrines of God's existence and providence. The worst that atheistic dramatists could do would be to observe silence. In a famous play of a decade back, *Shore Acres*, the playwright made the young lover some kind of a materialist; the father of the girl objected to him on the ground of his irreligion; although this father was something of a beast the audience gave him its sympathy on this point; and the young lover as a consequence remained always a very minor character indeed in the play. James Herne, the actor, was an agnostic, it is said, and his play of *Shore Acres* proved for the time just how far one may go in silently denying the existence of God.

The third convention of the drama is respect for religion. Although religion has no place in the average play, not even in so-called religious plays like *The Sign of the Cross* and *Mary of Mag-*

dala, yet it is an absolute convention, against which the unreligious dramatist would fight in vain, that religion must be respected both directly and indirectly. In consequence you will find no sneers at religion or its ceremonies and ministers in the popular play. Wherever the playwright can use the habiliments of religion to secure a fine effect or add to a scene he is more than willing to do so; hence the processions, marriages, preaching of sermons, and other religious forms so common in the play. In anti-Catholic times the popular drama occasionally denounced the "popish superstition." That expression has disappeared from the modern English drama. Natural religion is preferred before the religions of the sects, and the commonplace about a man being superior to creed is very acceptable. That also is a sign of the times. Whatever the taste of the dramatist, manager, or actor in the matter of religion may be, this fact must stand: that religion, when it has to be mentioned or treated, must receive proper respect.

The fourth convention of the popular play is the existence and the immortality of the soul. After a course of reading in the drama of the last fifty years one would become certain that no drama could please the multitude without the acceptance of that great doctrine of Christianity. In all their troubles *Blanche* and *Archibald*, hero and heroine of the play, fall back upon the long, long bliss of eternity for consolation. If death and villainy are to separate them forever in this life, then in a happier sphere, where all tears are wiped away, they will one day be reunited. The strength and popularity of this convention is well illustrated by the last act of *The Sign of the Cross*. Every manager insists upon a happy ending for a play, since an audience must not be sent away in tears and gloom; and, as was mentioned above, the average audience takes the stage illusion so seriously as to be utterly depressed by the lamentable ill-luck of the hero and heroine. It is uncommon, therefore, for a play to end with the death of any character save the villain's. Yet in *The Sign of the Cross* the last incident of the drama is the marching forth of hero and heroine into the arena to die for Christ. How was the audience reconciled to this tragedy? By the hero's declaration that he would never again be parted from his beloved; and since she was to die for her Lord, then he would also die a Christian, be with her in her agony, and join her in paradise. His sentiment was received with tremendous applause, and the entrance of the martyrs into the arena, while it evoked showers of tears, was looked upon as a triumph over the iniquity of the persecutors. Woe to that dramatist whose characters let out their secret belief in the death of the soul with the death of the body. Managers laugh at him, and so far audiences have not encountered his plays. The most delightful moment in the perennial *Uncle Tom's Cabin* is the ascent of Little

Eva and Uncle Tom into heaven, surrounded by angels and sun-kissed clouds!

The fifth convention of the popular play is the existence and malice of sin. The theories of the materialists on sin have not yet affected the English drama, except in special instances. The theological teaching concerning sin is not strictly accepted because playwrights know nothing of theology; but the necessity and beauty of repentance are everywhere accepted and often form the matter of the play; the malice of sin is recognized both in relation to the Deity and in its evil effects upon man; ingratitude to God, injury to the sinner himself, and injustice to his dependents, or to those affected injuriously by his sins, these are staple incidents of the average play; the special malice of crimes like blasphemy, of oppression of the poor, and the helpless, of defilement of the innocent, is recognized by consigning the culprit to the lowest pits of hell; the inability of man to punish adequately in such cases leads to a passionate demand for God's immediate judgment, and to a passionate expression of belief in His justice, in the particular judgment, and in the eternity of hell. It is on points of this character that the playwright generally quotes from the Holy Scriptures. Some popular quotations are: "Let him that is without sin among you cast the first stone;" "God willeth not the death of the sinner, but that he be converted and live;" "Woman, hath no man condemned thee?" Formerly these quotations implied the common belief in the divinity of Christ; but in the last ten years indications of a change have appeared, to the effect that Christ is only the inspired Master, and not the Son of God. This change corresponds to actual conditions among Protestants. A drama from the pen of an English minister, entitled *The Only Way*, which has been touring the country for the past two years, illustrates to perfection not only the conventions so far described, but also the changes in belief that have affected the Protestant world. This play is a dramatization of Dickens' Tale of Two Cities, and the theme is the sacrifice of himself made by Sydney Carton, in order that the woman he loves may be happy forever. In the prologue an unhappy victim of the lust and cruelty of certain French noblemen calls down upon them the vengeance of God, and appoints His judgment-seat for an accounting of all his wrongs; in the body of the play chaste love, repentance for sin, and the loftiest self-sacrifice find splendid expression; yet the hero takes the place of the young husband in the prison, and mounts the scaffold to death, with seemingly no consolation from religious hope in an eternal reward. The admission of modern indifferentism in the second half of the drama is a distinct disappointment, and offers a curious contrast to Mr. Belasco's last scene in *Dubarry*, where the

priest consoles the wretched woman and rides with her in the tumult to the scaffold. As Belasco probably professes no faith whatever, and the minister regularly preaches the gospel of his sect, the comparison is suggestive.

These five conventions of the popular play are concerned with pure Christian doctrine: the existence and providence of God, the truth and beauty of religion in general, the immortality of the soul, the existence and malice of sin and the final triumph of justice; together with their corollaries, the eternal life, judgment, heaven, hell, the need of pardon for sin, and of repentance. No play can secure presentation under ordinary circumstances, on the English-speaking stage, which does not tacitly recognize these doctrines. No playwright can afford to do worse than ignore them. The more they are respected and the more powerfully they are expressed, the more likely, other things being equal, that the play will succeed. All these conventions are commonplaces to the dramatic world, though perhaps they have never before been so distinctly formulated. For the sake of clear distinction let us call them the doctrinal conventions; then there remain the moral and the ideal conventions.

The sixth convention of the popular play demands that the hero and the heroine be exact observers of the Ten Commandments. This rule is absolute for the heroine, admitting only of exceptions that prove its universality; it is not so absolute for the hero, whose past may not have been spotless. It is absolutely necessary, however, that during the action of the play he should be perfection on this point. He must be honest, sober, chaste, clean of speech, devoted to his parents, pure, upright, honorable, the defender of women even against their own weakness, truthful to excess, faithful to friend, helpful to neighbor, true to country, and generous and forgiving to his enemies. She must be spotless, an angel lingering for a little in human form. Without this moral perfection it would be difficult to secure for the leading characters the proper sympathy. The minor characters are permitted some imperfections and sins, such as bad temper, gentle intoxication, occasional lapses from truth, and other diverting weaknesses, but only for a time; to hold the sympathy of the audience they must show a good stock of moral virtue. The villain of the play is credited with all the sins in the calendar, though the play may have proved him guilty only of injustice towards the leading characters.

The seventh convention demands lofty recognition for the ideal in life. This convention is so far-reaching, affects so intimately every part of the play, that its elucidation would need a paper by itself. Suffice it to say here that the drama in general is founded on the principle that its presentation shall give us what real life so rarely

gives, indeed cannot give: the triumphant resolution of a set of difficulties. We must see in the space of a few hours the beginning and the end of life; the anguish of virtue and the triumph of sin changed into the glorification of virtue and the eternal damnation of its enemy. In particulars the working of this convention can be seen clearly. The hero and the heroine must be young, handsome, unmarried, and virgins, with a capacity for one, undying love. The play will tolerate no widows and widowers except as minor characters; it will have nothing to do with divorce; it demands from the lovers the most exalted self-sacrifice; should one or the other (apparently) die, the survivor must utter a firm declaration to live in single blessedness and keep the grave green until heaven reunites them.

It is difficult to make an outsider understand the tremendous force of these conventions, how absolutely they rule actor, manager, and playwright. An experienced manager alone can adequately feel their power, particularly if he has suffered in the attempt to get along without them. The outsider cannot get his point of view for two reasons: he has never been a manager, and he has seen and heard of plays that rejected most of the conventions, and yet made a financial hit. These exceptions, however, only prove the rule. Some striking illustrations of the force of stage conventions exist, and are of such a nature as to be easily understood by the general public. I shall describe three of the best. First, contrast with the popular play the popular novel and the average newspaper. We are all fairly well acquainted with the influence which passing currents of thought have had upon the novel and the journal; how rapidly both have developed in the past fifty years; and how they have shaken off all restraint, whether exercised by their own conventions, or by the reading public. Every error in religion, morals, science, art, and letters, has been exploited in the popular novel; the pages of the daily journal teem with careful descriptions of crime; the editorials in all forms of the periodical press, newspaper, magazine, and review, advocate at one time or another the heresies of the past, present, and future. The country swarms with the printed page, and half of it carries the poison of the most virulent errors in doctrine or in method. The popular isms of the day, and the popular spasms as well, are in turn pompously exploited. The press is as responsive to the advent of a novel truth, or a novel error, as the mercury to the weather.

Against the winds of doctrine the popular play has stood firm for a century, intrenched in its conventions. Naturalism failed to make the slightest impression on the English drama; pessimism did not even make the attempt at an assault; only indifferentism secured a feeble success by reducing or abolishing the emotional expression.

of the conventions respecting religion, and by using divorce as a reputable escape from a difficulty. The plays in which God is no longer named, in which Christian ideas are gracefully suppressed, are more numerous than formerly; yet even in these plays the dramatist must respect the conventions sufficiently to avoid the suspicion of intended offense. Now this fact alone ought to bring the drama into solid repute with the prejudiced who read their journals daily and pay due attention to the magazines. There is a worse influence working in one week's output of the press than in the whole output of the stage for ten years. Compared with the press the popular play is an instrument of religious devotion. The press is revolutionary, the play conservative. The press absorbs error as a sponge does water; the play, for reasons not easily to be discovered, holds to its traditions. The press is condemned with discrimination, and the play without it. Such is the justice of the multitude!

When we reflect how completely modern error has taken possession of the press, it is impossible to withhold credit from the drama for its fidelity to its own conventions. Another instance of their strength is shown in the failure of Ibsen and other innovators to get a hearing from the public for their sickly dramas. Ibsenism is only a term for unhealthy and unprofitable innovation. Pinero has tried it. Paul Potter has tried it. French innovators are a legion. They have all failed to get a footing. Great assaults have been made, now on a single convention, now on a group, and occasionally on all. Dumas attacked the ideal love in *Camille*, Pinero did the same thing only the other day in *Iris*, Paul Potter made his hero a vile brute in *The Conquerors*, Stuart Robson made him an atheist in *The Gadfly*, Dumas tried again in *Denise*, Charles Frohman attempted to popularize adultery in adaptations from French comedies, Belasco lately gave us *Zaza* and *Dubarry*: it may be said comprehensively that they all failed. Dumas and Belasco made money, the others lost it; but with or without success no imitators came after them to emphasize their triumph or their failure. Ibsen is to-day the arch-conspirator against the stage conventions. He can write, more deftly than any living playwright, a drama in which there will be no God, no religion, no humanity, no faith, no morality, no love, no thought of eternity; which will reek of despair, dirt, darkness, and diabolism; which will shut out music, light, mirth, scenery, all graceful illusion; and from which an audience will fly in haste to the light of day, or the nearest buffet, dumb with horror. His plays have not disturbed the old, firm conventions. His friends storm the theatre in vain. It is a good deal to have withstood, not only the assaults of the time, but the direct siege of engineers like Ibsen.

The third example of the power of the old conventions appeals more to the Catholic than to others, and forms a fitting companion to the historic fact that the miracle plays are the source of the modern drama. The popular play enjoys an ever-growing sympathy with Catholic doctrine and practice. It is a long time since in the Surrey Theatre, London, Bulwer-Lytton gave us *Richelieu*, John Frederick Smith introduced his *Wolsey*, and Dion Boucicault pleased an audience with *The Pope of Rome*. Yet in the interval how kindly and effectively has the drama taken to Catholic personages, doctrines, and ceremonies! We have seen *The Parish Priest* working lovingly among his people, *The Cardinal* torn with anguish over the fate of his innocent brother, *Francesca Da Rimini* married by the cardinal in the stately cathedral with proper ceremonies, *The Eternal City* and its reverential pope, *The Broken Seal* with its holy but weak-minded Curé; and Thomas á Becket has fallen under blows of the assassin, Mary of Scotland has gone to her death, and Joan of Arc ascended the dreadful pile amid the tears of Protestants who softly cursed the persecutors of these noble souls. Actors have learned to wear sacred vestments, to take holy water properly, to bless themselves, to genuflect before the great altar, to visit the pope, to give a blessing, to give communion to the dying, and to bury the dead in the good, holy Catholic fashion; and audiences have even attended Mass as it were, have learned the beauty of Catholic rites, and have applauded to the echo popes, cardinals, bishops, priests, saints, and heroes of the Catholic faith, because in the play these stood forth as the champions of justice, and the protectors of the poor, the helpless, the innocent against the injustice of power. This sympathy of the play with things Catholic is emphasized by the indifference of the play to things Protestant. Outside of a marriage the bare Protestant rites have no place on the stage. Of course they lack the requisite picturesqueness. Protestant personages have rarely been made characters in a drama, largely because early Protestantism denounced the play and the player with equal vigor. Protestant themes, historic, social, or doctrinal, have entirely disappeared from the horizon of the average playwright. At the present moment Luther, Cranmer, Knox, Henry VIII. are impossible characters for the drama; while Richelieu is everlasting; and Hall Caine, after giving us Pius X. in *The Eternal City*, threatens us with an historic pope of the past for some future drama.

The character and the strength of these stage conventions, as described and illustrated in this article, ought to convince the most skeptical of the conservatism and worth of the popular play, ought to warn the wise to take instruction in the actual conditions before indulging in wholesale condemnation, and should urge a strict

examination of present temper towards the stage in general. In my opinion religious sentiment is barking up the wrong tree; the popular press, and not the popular play, is the coon to be dislodged. It is a patent fact that the press daily offends, in one fashion or another, against the first principles of Christian faith and Christian morality; as a matter of fact the press of America is the product of the purest indifferentism, and the strenuous, bigoted, blind advocate of that powerful error. The play has indeed been affected by the indifferentism of the playwright, but in a different way and to a slight degree. The force of the conventions, as I have shown, nullifies the malice of the playwright. This may be seen more clearly in the actual presentation of such plays as *A Parisian Romance*, *Jekyll and Hyde*, and *Marie Stuart*, the two first as played by Richard Mansfield, and the third, a translation from Schiller, by Madame Modjeska. The first preaches a distinct sermon on materialism, the second illustrates a moral principle, and the third overthrows for the audience a powerful political philosophy, which has dominated the English world for several centuries. Yet it can hardly be supposed that the playwrights or the actors had these results in view at any time.

The leading character of *A Parisian Romance* is the Baron De Chevrial, a rich blackguard, devoted at the age of seventy to the sensual pleasures, the crimes, which have marked his whole career. His brutal cynicism inspires the audience with disgust, his praise of earthly pleasure revolts them, and his ending, while it terrifies, satisfies them by its justice. In the fourth act of this play the Baron entertains at a dinner a number of dissipated young men and women; at the proper moment he rises to offer a blasphemous toast to materialism, the god whom he has always worshiped, the only god worth worshipping, to whom he is indebted for his success and his pleasures; and at this precise moment he is struck by death, paralysis destroys one-half his body, his god deserts him at the instant of praise; the frightened banqueters, to whom death is the devil, run from him in terror, and the old reprobate staggers about the room like a wounded wild beast, mumbling and cursing, until he falls stone dead. Whatever the intention of playwright or actor in this play the sermon on materialism is more perfect, more effective, from the merely human point of view, than the finest utterances of a Lacordaire.

The drama of *Jekyll and Hyde* illustrates the moral principle that men become very like the things they love. It would take a long time in ordinary speech to convince an audience of this truth, even with such common illustrations as the drunkard, the gambler, and the sensualist. In this play Dr. Jekyll has discovered the secret of

changing his noble personality at will into the monstrous character of James Hyde. By swallowing a certain powder the elegant figure, upright nature, and clean soul of Dr. Jekyll are instantly transformed into the deformed body, vile nature, and black soul of Hyde; in this character he steepes himself in the most loathsome vice, becomes more and more in love with vice, and changes so often into the character of Hyde that at last the transformation occurs automatically in sleep, against his will, without the use of the powder. The last act of the play shows the wretched man in hiding from the police, unable to secure the antidote which hinders him from becoming Hyde, dreading that inevitable metamorphosis, and still more the terrors of the law gathering around him. From his window he sees the good girl whom he loved passing along the street below, and in his anguish he cries out to her; she recognizes her lost lover and flies to him; but at that moment the police hammer at the door, with a convulsion the form of Jekyll shrinks into the proportions of Hyde, and he has just time to swallow the ready and instant poison when love and law enter to witness his death agony. The lesson to that audience is perfect, unforgettable, frightful; men become like the things they love.

Schiller's play of *Marie Stuart* is ancient in form and prosy and slow in presentation; but its contrast of the Queen of Scotland with the Queen of England does not lack interest. Marie Stuart has the first act, Elisabeth Tudor the second, both monarchs meet in the third act, Elisabeth signs the death-warrant in the fourth act, and in the fifth Marie takes leave of her friends and goes to execution. The ancient controversy over the Queen of Scots is still pending, and the latest book on the subject from Andrew Lang leaves the reputation of Queen Mary still in doubt. Elisabeth is no longer known as the Virgin Queen and Good Queen Bess except in a political sense. For three hundred years the writers of England with few exceptions found it necessary to labor earnestly in presenting a Marie Stuart to the people, which might serve their aims and ambitions; therefore Marie Stuart became a monster of iniquity, a human representative of the abstract Church of Rome, the scarlet woman, the woman of Babylon, the harlot of the seven hills; while Elisabeth, as her antagonist, was portrayed with honors, virtues, little short of the divine. This impression of the two queens still remains with the multitude. In three hours with Schiller's old play *Madame Modjeska* will destroy for any audience listening to her the political philosophy which engaged the abilities of all England for three centuries to build. Schiller's play, *Madame Modjeska*, and Agnes Strickland in her histories did more to bury that philosophy for the common people than all others combined.

This array of facts touching the popular play will naturally be accepted with suspicion by determined enemies of the drama in any form, and shelved on the kindly principle that the devil is never so black as painted. Is the play then so spotless, so perfect, that no one dare reproach it? Have we all been wrong in the suspicion, the distrust, the denunciation of the past century? Have we had to wait for a Daniel-come-to-judgment in order to discover our blunders and errors? Must we now turn to the theatre as to the temple and make amends for past hostility by sublime devotion? The answer to these moving questions is not difficult. Proof of the moral cleanness of Asbury Park does not bind anyone to spend a summer at that popular resort. Morally only two things are demanded of those convinced by this presentation of a fine case: to speak kindly of the popular play, and never again to denounce that of which they know little or nothing. The popular play is neither spotless morally, nor perfect artistically, only a trifle better than its playwrights, actors, managers, and audiences. It possesses their vulgarity, cheapness, low standard of thought, common expression, tawdry pride. Its minor conventions are for the most part sickly and inartistic, such as the love-making, which entitles the hero to treat a woman with disrespectful familiarity. He clasps her in his arms and talks into her mouth as if he were a throat specialist studying her bronchitis. The popular play always smacks of the times. It has a long way to climb towards perfection. The point made in this article is its fidelity to its own wise conventions. Another point is its superiority to that besotted press which floods the homes of the righteous, and from whose unclean pages the righteous get their bricks to fling at the play.

One fact with regard to the drama and the stage must be recognized and cheerfully accepted: they are institutions which have come to stay, and which will always be a great factor in public amusement. The over-delicate custom of past times, to run away from such a difficulty as an unclean drama, or to shut it out of society altogether, excommunicate actors and playwrights, and put the play and the players on a level with the bagnio and its promoters, is not suited to our methods and conditions. The play is universal. It has a footing in our convents and colleges almost as firm as in the days of St. Gregory of Nazianzen. Thousands of amateur actors have made it familiar in our parishes. If it be still a savage, an immoral barbarian, then we must do with it as Lacordaire advised with regard to Democracy: baptize it. A force so powerful with the people, a popular amusement so charming in itself, and so capable of great things, a fact so deeply rooted in the nature and the history of man, is not to be left entirely to the devil. Although the stage has been

carefully excluded from this essay, as a different question altogether, I would still include it in the regeneration of the drama, on the ground of its influence over the people. One remark will fitly close this article: whatever good exists in the popular play at this moment may be credited to the strength of its own fine conventions: whatever evil, to the indifference and hostility of the badly instructed good citizens of English-speaking lands.

JOHN TALBOT SMITH.

New York.

THE EXAMPLE OF NAPOLEON.

TO believers in the providence of God the question naturally presents itself at the present day, what will be ultimately the divine action in regard to the governments now persecuting the church in Europe. In Italy the Pope is still a prisoner in his palace and garden of the Vatican. In France the twentieth century opens with one of the most determined campaigns against religion. To say that it is directed only against the religious orders, means nothing. No one can be so simple as to honestly say it is not the Catholic, i. e., in the judgment of Frenchmen, the Christian, religion which is attacked. Humanly speaking, there is no hope for the poor Christians. They are apparently so inert and divided, and, after all, those of them who really deserve the name of Christians, so poor a minority, that little can be expected from any activity on their part. What then will Heaven do? Will God interfere to show that He still exists? He may not. God has permitted so much evil in this world that it is not easy to forecast what will be the direction or nature of His interference with human events. He permitted the terrible Mahometan inundation; He permitted the Protestant reform. What will He allow the infidel revolution of modern times to effect? A mystery indeed it is that the Almighty should permit the loss of so many human souls. But we know that He loves us, we know that His Son died for us. We know that He tolerates evil only to draw from it greater good, although that greater good may be invisible to our eyes. For even though the whole ancient civilized world should lose its integrity of faith, we could still hope that, in ways unknown to us, He would be able to save innumerable souls.

We must not then fear He is going to let once Catholic Europe fall entirely under the empire of Satan. We must hope especially

that He will not permit Italy, the centre of Christianity, where St. Peter established his see, and France, so long so gloriously Catholic, and where there is still so much faith and religion, to fall entirely under the heel of the conspiracy against religion and morality and truth. For we have instances too of the divine interference which are calculated to greatly encourage us, and to remind us that the Lord does not forget the world which He made. The story of the first Napoleon naturally occurs to the mind in this circumstance, it is full of teaching, and its teaching is that God will not abandon those who truly trust in Him, and though He may appear to be asleep like our Lord in the ship, His eye is always on His own, and He will so direct the course of human events that finally all things shall result to the benefit of His elect.

Napoleon Bonaparte was not originally a persecutor. He had been brought up in a Christian manner, had made his first Communion, and never wholly lost his belief in the Christian revelation. In the military school to which he was sent, he did not certainly inhale an atmosphere of piety, nor did he continue to practise his religion in the exciting days of the French revolution, which were coincident with his youth. He was carried away too by the high-sounding platitudes of the times, for he was human though a genius and very imperfectly educated. It is probable that his religious ideas were very greatly mixed from this want of thorough training. But, with his great intellect and extraordinary sense, he could hardly have made any great blunders had his motives been pure and free from passion. It was his selfishness, his desire to subject the interests of souls to what he considered the interests of the state, his gigantic ambition, a pride fed by unexampled success, which made him turn against the church of God and become in particular the enemy of the father of the faithful.

It was another chapter in the history of the contests between church and state. Very interesting and instructive indeed is this study of the varying attitudes towards each other in history of the state and the church. The relative, sometimes antagonistic, positions of science and revealed religion, is one of the burning questions of the present time. But perhaps no more important subject can occupy the attention of a Catholic, layman or cleric, than the story of the relations between the ecclesiastical authority which we call the church and that civil jurisdiction which is known as the state. These two independent sources of right have had to move down the stream of time side by side; it is clear it was for the advantage of both that they should move on harmoniously; it is equally clear that there must have frequently been danger of their jarring or clashing together. And, like the pots in the fable, it is clear enough

too, that, in this encounter, the weaker vessel would naturally be the sufferer. One reflection must be made, however, as to this point: what may appear the weaker material at the moment may be the stronger in the long run, may have the better wear. Thus the church *appeared* crushed by the Roman Emperors: in reality the Roman empire was destroyed, not the church. During the middle ages there was an everlasting struggle between the church and the German empire; the German empire disappeared, the church is as full of life as ever. A new German empire has been established, and hardly had it begun its existence when it wished to tussle with the church. But the man of blood and iron, who vowed he would not go to Canossa, was the first one to see that the empire, that is, the state, could not get on without the church, and he did not hesitate to make *volte-face* and go to Canossa, almost before being asked. A wise man he. And wise is his government in imitating his example and following every day more and more in his footsteps. Thanks for this to the heroic German centre party. While the Irish were united, they held the balance of power in the English parliament. So long as the German centre maintains its sturdy independence, it will control the destiny of Germany—and Germany will have reason to be grateful to its members. In what other country to-day do we find anything like this?

How the French revolution was brought about, how it developed its satanical character of hostility to religion, it does not concern us to dwell on here. What the world knows is that the first French republic met the fate which always attends anarchy combined with immorality. When the Greek republics, politically divided as they were, had degenerated from their early hardihood of life, it was no difficult task for Alexander of Macedon to subject them to his sway. When the Roman republic, having lost its primitive austerity of morals amid the corruption which seems to be the necessary consequence of a great accumulation of wealth, was worn out by the strife of opposing factions, then Julius Cæsar appeared, and he made himself master of Rome and the Roman world. The French republic was more an anarchy than a government, the result of the troubled fermentation of men who had denied all religion; it found its Alexander and its Cæsar in Napoleon Bonaparte. This is a law of history. We should pray that our own dear country, that country which we all proudly look to as the hope of the future for all mankind, which is only one century old, which has already gone through the throes of the most terrible of civil wars, which has already trembled before the prospect of a military dictatorship, which is so large, which has entered on a new adventurous course of expansion, wherein the socialistic doctrines of the day find an ever increasing

multitude of listeners, we should pray that God will spare it, that He will save it from political disunion and moral degradation, and so save it from the worst of all calamities for men who love manliness and the liberty of their own souls, from a Cæsar or an Alexander or a Bonaparte. And therefore for this reason we should ask that unbelief may not spread throughout the land, for with unbelief will spread theft and lust, and they will bring ruin; but that religion may cover it with her holy wings, and establish that reign of justice which exalteth nations and on which Heaven sends down its everlasting blessing.

On the 14th of March, 1800, Pius VII. was elected Pope. His predecessor had died a captive in France in the month of August of the preceding year. "At that time," says the Protestant historian, Ranké, "it seemed as if the Papal power was forever at an end." Indeed it did: the French republicans had swept through Italy; they first robbed the Pope of all his money; then they seized on his possessions, depriving him of his temporal power, but declaring, like Victor Emmanuel in the name of the Italian people to the late Pius IX., that he should remain a spiritual prince; then they carried him away a prisoner to die in exile. But after the death of the Sovereign Pontiff the French arms met with reverses in Italy, so that the Cardinals were able to meet in conclave, and the Cardinal Chiaramonti, bishop of Imola, was elected Pope, under the title of Pius VII. The circumstance which caused the French to meet with defeat in Italy, and so gave an opportunity to the Cardinal princes of the Catholic Church to elect a new Pontiff, was the recall of the general who had gained those victories by which the French had become masters of the Italian peninsula. Thus did it happen, as it has happened many times over and over again in days of distress and amidst the gale of persecution, that Almighty God interfered at the most critical moment and evidently so directed the course of events as to prevent the bark of Peter from being shipwrecked in the storm. Should therefore the thirteenth Leo die, as the sixth Pius and the ninth Pius did, while yet a prisoner in the hands of his enemies, we shall have just cause to hope that they who already rejoice in the approaching ruin of the Papacy will not have a real reason for triumph, that God will watch over His little ones, that He will protect those who have to minister to them and will provide another pastor for His fold, and that He will make all things conduce to the greater glory of His holy name.

The general who, by defeating the Austrians, had conquered Italy, was Napoleon Bonaparte, the man destined to reestablish order in France and to keep all Europe in constant war for half a generation. Hardly had the Pope been elected when Napoleon was sent back to

Italy, where he again drove the Austrians from that country, another manifest indication that he had been withdrawn by Divine Providence only in order that the Catholic Church might have the necessary respite and freedom to elect another head to fill the place of its departed ruler. The conqueror of Italy and Egypt was soon declared first consul or chief governor of France, and he at once set about restoring order and good administration to that distracted nation. He framed a perfect code of laws and reorganized all the branches of government. But his great intellect understood that he could not regenerate a people unless he established among them some kind of a religion; for without religion no society is possible; no society has ever actually existed without religion; infidels themselves have said that it would be necessary to invent a religion, if there were none, to preserve society; and, without its powerful control, it is too late in the world's history for even our modern theorists and reformers to expect to be able to keep men together in any kind of social union. But Bonaparte wished to reinstate the true religion in that land from which it had been violently expelled or driven to be practised in covert retreats, and this for several very good reasons. First, he was himself a believer, he had been taught the Catholic faith, and he admitted to one of his marshals that the happiest day of his life was, not when he had won a great victory, but the day of his first Communion; secondly, he knew that the majority of the French people were still attached to their traditional belief and would change it for no other; and, thirdly, he was aware that no form of worship has such power in subjecting men's hearts to true obedience to all legitimate laws as that ancient and Catholic religion so severely inflexible in its principles and so sweetly gentle in the method of inculcating and enforcing its precepts. At this time Bonaparte showed his strong sense in opposition to the suggestions of those around him, and proved that he was not altogether a bad man where his own ambition was not interested. He would not make himself the head of a new church, he knew better than that. "Do you wish me to be crucified?" he said to those who urged him to found a religion of his own. He believed it was the unity of the Catholic faith which made France strong; and he knew that without the *true* faith that unity could not exist. Protestantism therefore with its divisions had no charm for him, and, great as was his confidence in himself, he did not think that he could unite Frenchmen in believing in a doctrine of his own creation, unless, like our Lord, he died in proof of his divinity, a thing which he was not prepared to do. But here his wisdom ended. He knew that he could not make the state a church, but he did not know that he could not subordinate the church to the state. He did not wish to make himself

Pope, but he thought that he could subject the Pope to himself. He did not wish to call Cæsar God, but he thought that he could cause to be given to Cæsar the things which belonged to God. Accordingly one of the first acts of the young Corsican general after assuming power in France was to open negotiations with the Holy See for the restoration of divine worship in that country. These negotiations led to the famous *concordat* or agreement between the French government and the Pope, by which ecclesiastical discipline was regulated in the French republic in such a way as to assure harmony between the spiritual and the temporal powers.

A very singular episode in church history is connected with the *pourparlers* for affecting this concordat. Napoleon asked that all the ancient episcopal sees in France and the countries annexed to France be suppressed and new ones established more coincident with the revolutionary divisions of the country into departments. And this was to be done within a few days. The Holy Father had therefore to ask all the bishops still living to send in their resignations, that, abolishing the old dioceses, he might appoint bishops to the new ones. This was certainly a tremendous exercise of the Papal power. But it was not beyond that power, and circumstances made it necessary. A few French bishops refused to resign, and so originated the schism of the *petite église*, a little body of Christians more Christian than the Pope. This little schism, more political than religious, like so many things in France, continued to live on till the end of the nineteenth century. Fourteen hundred years before, the Catholic bishops of Africa, with St. Augustine at their head, had offered unanimously to lay down their mites in favor of the Donatists, if these would return to the bosom of the church—a more perfect example of the true episcopal spirit.

On Easter Sunday, 1802, the solemn sacrifice of the Mass was offered up, for the first time in ten years, in the Cathedral of Notre Dame in Paris by the Cardinal-legate of the Holy See, in the presence of the first Consul and all the great French officials. The French revolution was at an end apparently: a new order of things was inaugurated: the church came out from the crucible of persecution through which she had passed, pure, unalloyed, vigorous, and that church of France, which, since that time, has had to battle and has to battle, against so many elements of infidelity and hostility, has proved, by the conduct and integrity of its clergy and its episcopacy, that the trials of persecution did it no harm. We must not suppose, however, that the behavior of the first Consul in this business was all that could be desired by fervent Catholics. Partly on account of the circumstances of the time and the necessity of yielding to the wishes of others perhaps in some points, partly, and in

great measure no doubt, on account of his own looseness of religious principle, shaken as it was by his education in the midst of infidels and revolutionists, and his indisposition to grant too much power to a church which he wished to control while leaving it what he considered sufficient liberty, the young ruler hampered the concordat with conditions which entailed great sacrifices on the part of the Holy See. In the first place, all the confiscated church property was to be left in the hands of its purchasers. The church never haggles on account of this world's goods, she belongs to another sphere, and knows that the Lord who chose poverty for His own bride will always provide sufficiently for her sustenance, and that He often allows her to be despoiled of her earthly goods in order to enrich her with more spiritual treasures; this point offered no difficulty. Then it was required, as has been said, that new limits should be appointed to all the dioceses in France and that all the ancient and expatriated bishops should give in their resignations in order that new ones might be named in their place. This too the church submitted to. The Holy Father even appointed to the new bishoprics, to please the French government, several schismatical and excommunicated prelates, after however they had made their submission, asked forgiveness and obtained absolution from their censures. There was nothing to which the Catholic Church would not stoop to save thirty millions of souls, except that which was wrong in itself. In all this negotiation whenever anything was proposed by the French government which was contrary to Catholic principle and the duty of the head of the Christian Church, it was inflexibly refused. The Consul or his ministers appended to the rest of the concordat a series of "organic articles," so they were called, which had never been agreed to by the Papal envoy, and which were intended to subject absolutely the clergy to the civil government. These articles the Pope never accepted, and, though succeeding governments tried sometimes to resuscitate them, they have never had in France any effect.

In the year 1804 Bonaparte changed his title of Consul for the higher one to which since his return from Egypt he had aspired, and was thenceforth known as Napoleon, first Emperor of the French. On the 14th of September of that year he wrote to Pope Pius an autograph letter, asking him to come to Paris to perform the ceremony of his coronation. Pius VII. was a gentle and benign Pontiff. With all Europe he admired this wonderful young man, this genius created by providence to draw order out of the chaos which two centuries of infidelity and heresy had brought about in Europe and which reached its climax in the horrors and wars of the French revolution. But Pius the VII. was moreover a father, he was the

father of the whole Christian Catholic Church, and he had the heart of a father for all his children. It is certain, strange as their relations afterwards became, that there existed to the end in the heart of the Pontiff a great affection for this wayward child of fortune, who, after receiving his first education from a Christian mother, was sent at the early age of ten to a military school, there to be surrounded during his youth by an atmosphere impregnated with every kind of evil, and who now in his early manhood, notwithstanding his strength of intellect, was already intoxicated by the glory of unprecedented military success. With cheerfulness therefore the Holy Pontiff yielded to the invitation to crown the young conqueror, in the hope no doubt that his very presence would exercise a beneficial influence on one whom he would not willingly believe to be bad at heart and who still possessed the Catholic faith. The two monarchs, the spiritual ruler and the temporal ruler, met at Fontainebleau on the 25th of November, 1804, and on the second of the following month the ceremony of coronation took place.

What a terrible thing it is to become the slave of any passion! Napoleon was now in his zenith. Could he be content with enough, were it in his power to put a limit to his ambition, he might have founded the most powerful dynasty which ever reigned in Europe. The limits of France had been pushed to their furthest extent, the influence of the young French emperor was all powerful all over the continent; with his great intellect and genius, with his talent for organization, and his military prestige to be called upon to back and enforce his wishes in case of need, the new sovereign might have peacefully swayed and governed by wise policy and discretion a subservient Europe; and, had he given himself up wholly, like St. Louis and Charlemagne, to the cause of Christian revelation, had he undertaken in the proper way to oppose and stem the revolutionary tide which was then, and is still to-day, threatening to engulf the world in the waters of a new deluge, had he opposed it and checked it and dried it up in its source by devoting all his energies and all his influence to the religious education of his people, so as, by enlightening them on their duties towards God and on God's providence over them, to make them at the same time good citizens and happy subjects, he could have ruled like Constantine and Charlemagne over the whole of united Christendom. But Napoleon Bonaparte was the slave of personal ambition. He may have been blind in part to this fact, and imagined that he wished to subject all nations to France, which he had necessarily subjected to himself. But to this ambition he sacrificed all things. Already he had imbued his hands with the blood of the innocent duke of Enghien, a provoked but still an unjustifiable crime, which made the author of it

feared and detested by every nation. To this ambition he sacrificed his first wife, Josephine, after many years of union; for this ambition he obliged his brother to annul his marriage with an American lady in order that he might espouse a European princess. It was this ambition which brought on his quarrels with the Holy Father, and, by leading him into a constant series of unnecessary wars, became finally the cause of his fall, the loss of everything and the miserable termination of his career.

In 1805 war broke out between England, Austria and Russia on the one side and the Emperor of the French on the other. Napoleon ordered his general St. Cyr to occupy Aneona in the Papal States. This was the first positive step which the new despot had taken to show his intention of ruling over the Papal States as temporal master, and all the remonstrances of the Holy Father had no affect in inducing him to go back upon the deed. His final answer to the head of the church was insolent in the extreme. It was followed by a demand that all the subjects of governments hostile to the Emperor, English, Russians and Swedes, should be expelled from the Pontifical territory. "All Italy must be subject to my law," wrote the Emperor to the Pope. "I will not touch the independence of the Holy See, but on the condition that your Holiness will have for me in the temporal order the same deference that I bear towards you in spiritual matters. You are sovereign in Rome, but I am also Emperor there." But Pius VII., mild as he was, was not the man to yield to the unjust demands of any earthly monarch. Already when he had gone to crown the emperor in France, he had left his abdication in Rome to be made use of in case he were detained a prisoner by his rude host; he had no intention of keeping the empty title of head of a church without any independence, like the Archbishop of Canterbury in England or the Synod of the Russian church in St. Petersburg. Therefore all Europe might crouch before the Conqueror, emperors might change their titles and kings might resign their thrones at his pleasure; he might be allowed to place crowns and coronets on the heads of all his relations and favorites; there was one old man, the ruler of an insignificantly small territory, who would not yield to please his wish one iota of what he knew it to be his duty to maintain. Thus wrote the Pope to the Emperor: "The Pontiff does not recognize, and has never recognized, in his states any power superior to his own. You are immensely great, but you have been elected and crowned Emperor of the French, not of Rome." And the following words are to be noticed as furnishing a key to the necessity for the temporal independence of the Holy See. "A Catholic sovereign is such only because he bows before the definitions of the visible head of the Church, and regards the Pontiff as

the teacher of truth, as the only Vicar of God on earth. *Such feelings cannot be those of a sovereign towards another sovereign.*" But the pride of the soldier of fortune had now carried him to an excess of conceit which surpasses all imaginable extravagance. "He (Napoleon)," he writes again to the Holy Father, "was not only the greatest warrior of the age, but if he were a little more master of the world, he would show what a Sovereign Pontiff he would make, he would prove himself more wise and pious than Pius himself, he would take better care of souls, and generally attend better to the interests of religion." In fact Bonaparte, who could do what he pleased in the temporal sphere, and had his ambition already sated in that respect, aspired to rule over souls as well as bodies. What did it profit him that men should bow their necks to his yoke, if they would not also submit their consciences to his will? "Who are these priests," he exclaimed, "who keep men's souls, and throw me only their carcasses?" "I was not born at the right time," he said to a courtier; "Alexander the Great called himself the son of Jupiter, and no one dared to contradict him. I find in my time a man stronger than myself and he is a priest, for he reigns over spirits and I govern mere matter." What a commentary on the vanity of human pride and ambition! Here is a man who wishes to be excelled by no one who ever lived, and because he cannot obtain the impossible he is unhappy. It ought not to have been difficult to foretell what would be the conduct of the man who could so speak towards that other man whose superior powers he envied, of the soldier toward the priest. He began by withdrawing his ambassador from Rome, and replacing him by one more fitted for the execution of violent measures. He next takes military possession of a great part of the pontifical territory. "Tell the Emperor," said the Pope to the departing Ambassador, "that, in spite of his ill-treatment, we preserve a deep feeling of attachment to the French nation. But we are sovereign and shall remain independent. If he uses violence, we shall protest before the world. If necessary we shall use the temporal and spiritual means which God has placed in our hands."

"His Holiness dares to threaten me," wrote Napoleon. "His thoughts are centuries behind the age. There were kings before there were popes. What does he mean by denouncing me to Christendom? Does he intend to excommunicate me? and if he does, will his excommunication cause the muskets to fall from my soldiers' hands?" These very words show that the Emperor had misgivings as to his own conduct. Much more wisely had he spoken, and by much better inspiration, when, six years before, in answer to the question of the first envoy whom he sent to Rome, how should the Holy Father be treated. "Treat him," answered the then Consul;

"treat him as though he had two hundred thousand soldiers at his back." But Napoleon was older now, that blush of modesty which accompanies the elevation of almost any man to power for the first time had worn off, and the conqueror of the world could no longer make the effort even to disguise his illimitable arrogance. Not till the 2d of February, 1808, however, did the French troops enter the city itself of Rome, and only on the 10th of June, 1809, at ten o'clock in the morning, the pontifical flag was lowered from the Castle of St. Angelo amid the thunder of artillery, and the tricolor hoisted in its place. This was the consummation of the crime of sacrilege and spoilation: the next morning a Papal bull was found posted at the gates of the basilicas of St. Peter, St. Mary Major and St. John Lateran, wherein, after relating how, on the feast of the Purification, while he was himself offering up the divine sacrifice, the capital of Christendom had been sacrilegiously invaded, after enumerating the excesses committed during the following year and a half, similar in character to those perpetrated by the present occupiers of the holy city, after declaring that if, as related in scripture, Naboth could not give up the vineyard which was his inheritance from his forefathers, much less could he, the Supreme Pontiff, yield up the vineyard confided to his custody by the Lord, the Holy Father pronounces the sentence of greater excommunication against those who have taken part in these outrages.

What was the pretext which the French Emperor made use of to deprive the Father of the faithful of his temporal possessions? Because he persisted in not violating his duty as a neutral. Napoleon published an edict declaring all the ports of England in a state of blockade. Though he had no fleet to blockade them, so submissive were the continental powers to the will of the autocrat that they ceased commercial relations with the island-kingdom. Napoleon sends orders to the Sovereign Pontiff to expel English and other subjects from the city and forbid English vessels entering his ports; the Pontiff, the weakest of temporal kings, though France was supposed to be a Catholic power and the English were a Protestant people, answers that he cannot in conscience violate his duty towards a nation with which he is at peace—and Napoleon in consequence strips him of his territory.

In the middle of the night of the 5th and 6th of July, a band of brigands—for such only could they be called—broke into the pontifical palace, and the Sovereign Pontiff was hurried secretly away from the centre of Christendom and forced to enter upon a long exile. For a short distance he was allowed the company of his dearest friend, the Cardinal Pacca, but so hasty was their departure that they found that the Holy Father had with him only twenty-two

pence and the Cardinal sixteen. "Truly an apostolic way," exclaimed the Pontiff, "to begin an expedition." The hardships and unnecessary cruelty of this journey I pass over; but, just as when the hordes of Victor Emmanuel broke into the holy city under the ninth Pius, so when this gentle and venerable champion of the rights of independent states, Pius VII., was dragged ruffianly through Italy and France, all Europe looked on in silence, no government raised its voice to protest against the deed, "a striking illustration of the truth," says Cardinal Pacca in his *Memoires*, "that the successor of St. Peter must not put his trust in princes." The chief pastor of the church, however, was not without consolation in the midst of all his afflictions. Everywhere that he passed he was received with ovations by the populations, in France as well as in Italy; all pressed to receive his blessing, and their sympathy was enough to make him forget the hardship of his treatment. Yet he sank under this hardship. During the passage from Savona to Fontainebleau, he became so ill that it was necessary to administer the last sacraments. Nevertheless travelling was not suspended a moment; the great bully was trying to frighten the old man, the soldier was trying to conquer by violence the minister of peace. A vain effort. But more artful means followed. The bishops of France, all of them appointed to their sees by Napoleon, did not at this time behave, as a body, with the courage which has so often distinguished the episcopacy of that country. Many of them tried to cajole out of the Holy Father concessions which were contrary to his conscience. Not all, however, but those who did not were deprived of their bishoprics and cast into prison. Napoleon had obliged most of the Cardinals to come to Paris, that he might parade them at his court. Thirteen of the number refused to be present at his second marriage while his first wife was still living, unauthorized as they knew it to be by the Pope. They exposed themselves to the danger of death from the anger of their infuriated tyrant. Death he did threaten to some, but he feared to make martyrs, and confined himself actually to punishing them by obliging them to lay aside their purple robes and dress in simple black like common priests. Hence they were afterwards known as the black cardinals. One simple priest, however, knew how to face and subdue this wild untamed offspring of the mountains of Corsica. This was M. Emery, the superior of the Seminary of St. Sulpice, a man eighty years of age. "How is it," said Napoleon to him, "that you and all the bishops of France who have studied theology all your lives, that you cannot find any way of settling my difficulties with the Pope? Had I studied divinity but six months, I would easily solve the difficulty, for God has given me understanding." "Who is the Pope?" asked he again one day of the same man in a tone of furious

anger, in one of his frequent fits of unrestrained violence. "The Pope," answered the venerable priest, "is what he is said to be in the catechism taught by your Majesty's order in all the churches of France. The Pope is the head of the church, the vicar of Christ, to whom all Christians owe obedience." "The Abbé Emery," afterwards said the Emperor, "speaks like a man who knows what he is talking about." "Had Napoleon found in all the bishops of France," is the reflection of the Cardinal Pacca, "the same energy and prudence, he would never have become a persecutor."

God is slow, very slow, for He has all eternity behind Him. On the very day when the Holy Father was carried away from Rome, Bonaparte gained the great victory of Wagram; heaven seemed to be still heaping successes upon him. But England yet braved him and Russia, and all Asia beyond it, still remained unsubjected. On the 9th day of May, 1812, at the head of an army of six hundred and fifty thousand men, he set out to subdue Russia, or rather to subdue the world. This vast army was composed of the best disciplined veteran troops, who had never known defeat, and who, under Napoleon himself, believed themselves invincible. At Dresden eight monarchs came to offer him their homage. "During his stay in this city," says the historian Alison, "four kings were frequently to be seen waiting in his ante-chamber; queens were the maids of honor to Maria Louisa. With more than Eastern magnificence he distributed diamonds and gold and crosses among the innumerable crowd of princes, ministers, dukes and courtiers who thronged around his steps." Meanwhile the Holy Father was being hurried from Italy to France in a journey which was uninterrupted even while he was being administered the last sacraments of the church. On the 23d of June the army reached the river Niemen which divided the territories of Russia and Prussia. As the Emperor rode along the bank, his horse stumbled and threw him to the ground. The general de Ségur, an eye-witness, has left us a vivid account of the disastrous campaign which followed. Over the desert earth, following an enemy who always fled away and could never be found, the French soldiers began to suffer from every privation. It was now God's time. Every element was turned against the invading army, earth, air, fire and water. On their very entrance into the Russian Empire they were saluted by a terrific storm, which occasioned to them the loss of ten thousand horses. After many delays and calamities they reached the city of Moscow, but it was to see it destroyed at night by fire kindled by the hands of its own inhabitants. But what saddened the French officers above all was to see that their chief had no longer his accustomed vigor: in mind and body he appeared no longer the same man. A

miserable infirmity, the same from which his nephew habitually suffered, disabled him from attending with his usual strength of mind to the direction of affairs. It became necessary to retreat. And now let us listen to the words of the historian of this march. Bonaparte had often repeated to Cardinal Caprara what he had written to Eugene Beauharnais. "Does the pope think that his excommunication will make the muskets fall from the hands of my soldiers?" "On the 6th of November," writes de Ségur, "the sky becomes covered, the snow begins to fall accompanied by gusts of wind, as though the heavens were coming down to join with the earth and this hostile people to consummate our ruin. The frozen soldiers fall on the snow, which covers them until the whole line of march is filled with these mounds of human bodies like graves in a graveyard. . . . Their weapons appeared to their stiffened hands to be an insupportable burden. Frequently they stumbled and their guns falling from their hands were lost in the snow. They did not throw them away; cold and hunger snatched them from their grasp." When the main portion of the French army crossed the Beresina, it was reduced to ten thousand men. There the Emperor abandoned it, and the horrible sufferings which still remained for it to undergo, we may here omit.

Five months after the Holy Father had been brought to Fontainebleau, and a little more than six months after his own departure from Paris at the head of his brilliant army of six hundred and fifty thousand men, the Emperor Napoleon Bonaparte returned to his capital, a fugitive, the first to escape of all that host now reduced to about twenty thousand wretched wanderers. With that energy which, combined with his intellect, made him the prodigy he was, the defeated hero set to work immediately to create another army great as the one which he had lost. But now he felt, more than he ever had before, the necessity of being on good terms with the Holy See. The health of the Holy Father, who was now seventy-one years of age, had been so impaired by sickness, the harsh treatment he had undergone, grief for the afflictions of the church, and his being deprived of the presence of all his trustworthy counsellors while he was constantly surrounded by the artful minions of his enemy, that his mind also became weakened to some extent and his strength of will remained no longer the same. When therefore the perfidious soldier came to visit him in his place of captivity, and unblushingly threw his arms around his neck and kissed his cheek, the loving-hearted pontiff forgot all the ill treatment he had received, accepted these demonstrations as symptoms of genuine affection, and gave undeserved confidence to the assurance and desire for sincere reconciliation of a man who

only sought to strengthen his political position by the subservient co-operation of the church. Various accounts are given us of the interviews between Napoleon and Pius VII. It appears that the royal executioner adapted alternately with his victim the system of caresses and abuse. Once he was on the point of striking him in the face. Finally the harassed Pontiff yielded to his adversary so far as to accept and sign his name to a compromise on the points that were debated; by so doing he hoped to escape from still greater concessions, but the compromise itself involved a sacrifice of church-principle. The Emperor, having obtained what he came in search of, went his way, and had it publicly proclaimed that a new concordat was agreed to by the Pope, and a perfect mutual good understanding existed between them both. No proclamation could have done more to sustain the waning popularity of the leader battling against adverse fortune. The Pope himself, however, who had here committed a grave fault—if a man no longer possessed of physical strength enough to be complete master of his reason was capable of committing a serious fault—so soon as the deed was done, fell into the profoundest melancholy, a state of remorse bordering on despair. But Pius had now drunk the last drop in the cup of humiliation by which God intended to perfect his sanctity. He fell, though under circumstances of the greatest extenuation for his fall, but it served him to give an example of sublime humility. Encouraged by his faithful friends and servants, the illustrious Cardinals Pacca and Consalvi, who were now allowed to return to his side, he rallied from his despondency, and on the 24th of March, wrote with his own hand a letter to the Emperor wherein he retracts and annuls all the imprudent concessions he had made. "In the presence of God," he writes, "to whom we shall soon be called to give an account, we acknowledge with grief and confusion that we should be using our authority, not to build up, but to destroy, had we the misfortune to execute what we imprudently promised, not, as God is our witness, with any evil intention, but through pure weakness, for we are but dust and ashes." Here is the priest! And who is the greater of the two, Napoleon Bonaparte, with all his genius, but with his want of principle, or Pius VII., worn and almost dying, humbling himself for an involuntary fault? But Bonaparte was the embodiment of that greatness which the world admires, Pius VII. was the realization of a sublimer ideal to which only the grace of God can give a living existence.

What vengeance the disappointed Emperor would have wrecked upon the courageous servants who had advised the Father of the faithful to this step, had victory enabled him to reestablish his power in Europe, we cannot tell. But his time was over. On the 23d of

January, 1814, Pius was obliged to depart from Fontainebleau for the south of France: on the 1st of April of the same year, Napoleon, beaten, no longer in Russia and in Germany, but in France itself, and obliged to retreat to the same oft mentioned Fontainebleau, and abandoned by all his friends, there heard of his dethronement by the very senate which he had created to sustain his uncertain power. Three days later he there signs his own abdication, and learns that he is to be banished and confined an exile and a captive himself on the isle of Elba. In half a year he leaves Elba, to invade France, so to say, all alone, but only to be beaten again at Waterloo and, after seven dreary years, to end his days, like a chained eagle, on the bleak crest of St. Helena, an island belonging to Great Britain off the coast of Africa.

Pius VII. returned to Rome. One of the first acts of this holy Pontiff on his restoration to the Apostolic throne was one which makes his memory very dear to every member of the order founded by St. Ignatius of Loyola. His predecessor, Clement XIV., forty-two years before, forced by the enemies of God to sacrifice one religious association in order to save the church from greater persecution, had suppressed the Society of Jesus. Pius VII., less than two months after his return to Rome, re-constituted it. By this act he intended to apply a remedy to some of the evils from which Christian society suffered, by resuscitating a body of men who devoted their lives to study, and who had for object to teach and preach sound doctrine in every way to every kind of people. The Society of Jesus had gone down into the grave by unjust persecution, like Him whose name it bore: so long as the spirit of the Heart of Jesus animates it, it will be forever grateful to the pope to whom it owes its resurrection.

Pius VII. lived till the year 1823, that is, till the age of ninety-one, and his reign was the longest reign of all the successors of St. Peter except the remarkable one of the venerated Pius IX., and the still more wonderful one of the present Leo XIII. After much suffering, he lived to see long days of peace. A few moments before he expired, an attendant addressed him by the title of "Your Holiness!" "What," he exclaimed, "Holiness? I am but a poor sinner." So died Pius VII., and who can doubt that he was a saint? Two years before him, Napoleon gave up his soul to his maker. He received the sacraments of the church with apparent joy, but, if he has obtained the one thing necessary for even the greatest genius, we may ascribe it without hesitation in great part to the prayers of the injured pontiff who, both before and after his death, recommended daily his poor soul to God.

But the vicissitudes of the Bonaparte family did not end with

Napoleon I. He had a nephew. This extraordinary character, after a strangely varied career, having apparently, for a considerable time, swayed the destinies of Europe, died thirty years ago in an obscure village in England, an exile. The sinister fate of Louis Napoleon recalled to Catholics the story of his uncle. For to *their* minds the one case threw light upon the other, the same causes or similar causes operated the same or similar effects in the case of both men; the same Divine providence which had raised both uncle and nephew to the sublimity of power, for the same reason and by similar ways, brought both nephew and uncle to destruction. No Roman Catholic hesitated to ascribe his misconduct towards the venerable head of the Catholic church as the reason why God hurled the first Napoleon from power, and sent him from his palace in Fontainebleau a reeling prisoner, first to Elba, and then to end his restless career on the rock of St. Helena amid the lone waves of the Atlantic Ocean. And when Louis Napoleon was taken from the fated city of Sedan first a prisoner to the fortress of Wilhelmshoe, and then went into banishment to die at Chiselmhurst, no Roman Catholic failed to recognize that the hand of God had struck him too because he had been unfaithful to his trust as the head of a Catholic nation and had betrayed the Father of the faithful into the hands of his enemies. The political consequences of the second French emperor's treason to the Holy Father, to Pius IX., still continue in the present condition of things in Rome and Italy as well as France. Had Napoleon III. boldly and consistently declared himself a Catholic ruler, Catholic France was still strong enough to assure not only the perpetuity of his reign but also of his dynasty. But he seems to have adopted with a kind of family adoration all the ideas of his uncle as they were crudely formed in that great mind, only enveloping them in a robe of more mysterious duplicity. This man had read how, when the Papal power was considered definitely destroyed by the first French republic, the Cardinals were providentially enabled to meet in Venice on the demise of Pius VI. and elect his successor Pius VII. in all liberty. He had seen how his uncle, when he had consummated the measure of his iniquities, was struck by the hand of God with defeat, knocked from his throne, and Pius carried back triumphantly to Rome, and the Protestant nations of Europe insisting upon rendering him all honor as the first of temporal potentates. He knew that his uncle had had a son by his second wife, to whom he audaciously gave the title of king of Rome, and he knew what the fate of that child had been. Yet he abandoned the Holy Father, struck treacherously at his temporal power, and contributed to the formation of a kingdom of Italy built on robbery and blood. This half Christian half free-thinker, half prince half conspirator, had not read history

well. He too lost his empire, had his Elba in Wilhelmshoë and his St. Helena in Chiselhurst. He may not have been obliged to undergo the indignities to which his great uncle was subjected, but his humiliation was substantially the same. And so curious were the coincidences between the calamities which the French nation suffered on his account and the blows struck at the Holy See by the perfidious Italian government, that it is worth while to mention them. On the very day when the evacuation of Rome by the French troops was announced, the French army met its first repulse from the Germans at Wissenburg; on the day and at the hour when the French general at Rome embarked for France, it suffered its second and overwhelming defeat at Woerth. On the day when the last 4,000 French troops left the Papal States, 4,000 French prisoners fell into the hands of the Prussians. On the day when the Piedmontese seized Civita Vecchia, the Prussians entered Versailles. On the day when the Italians completed the investment of Rome, the Germans completed the investment of Paris. On the 23d of January, 1871, Prince, afterwards King, Humbert entered Rome to take up his residence at the Quirinal: on the same day Jules Favre went to Versailles to offer the capitulation of Paris. And on the 1st of February, when the Italian government declared the deposition of the Pope an accomplished fact, the army of Bourbaki, 80,000 strong, crossed the frontiers of Switzerland, and France lay crushed under the foot of her conqueror, an accomplished fact indeed. We need not add how, as the only son and child of the greater Napoleon died, the only son and child of Louis Napoleon perished too, in an obscure skirmish, by the hand of a savage, fighting for England, in South Africa.

With the Lord a thousand years are as a day, and a day as a thousand years. His arm is not shortened, and when He wills He can cause His enemies to disappear like mist before the wind. Will He interfere, when will He, how will He? Or will He let once Christian Europe lapse into the condition of the peoples of the East? We know not. The German race broke the unity of the church. The Latin race seems to be going further and sinking into infidelity, while the northern nations show signs of a return to the true religion. What we do know is that there will always exist the Roman Catholic Church, and that, when all the pseudo-dynasties and hastily constructed empires and so-called republics shall have passed away, there will be living a man the ruler over hundreds of millions of souls, because he is the vicar of Jesus Christ, the depository of all spiritual authority on earth. He may be dwelling in peace; he may be surrounded by ten thousand enemies. His subjects, who will be his children, will be scattered all over this globe. He will probably be an old man, weak in body, strong in mind, and acknowledgedly

the one only great man of his time. But he will never die, for he belongs to a line of kings which cannot perish, nor their kingdom; for it was to them and to him that Christ said: "The gates of hell shall not prevail against *thee*, for I shall be with *you* till the consummation of ages."

D. A. MERRICK, S. J.

New York.

THE CHURCH IN THE PHILIPPINES.

LEO XIII.—FOR A PERPETUAL REMEMBRANCE.

THE broad stretch of islands bounded by the China Sea and the Pacific Ocean which Philip II., King of Spain, called the Philippines, were scarcely opened up by Ferdinand Magellan at the beginning of the sixteenth century when, with the image of the Holy Cross planted on their shores, they were consecrated to God and offered as a first fruit offering of the Catholic religion.

From that time the Roman Pontiffs, with the aid of Charles V. and Philip his son, both remarkable for their zeal for spreading the faith, have thought nothing more urgent than to convert the islanders, who were idol worshippers, to the faith of Christ. With God's help, by the strenuous efforts of the members of different religious orders, this came about very favorably and in such a short time that Gregory XIII. decided to appoint a Bishop for the growing Church there, and constituted Manila an Episcopal See. With this happy beginning the growth which followed in after years corresponded in every way. Owing to the united measures of our predecessors and of the Spanish kings slavery was abolished, the inhabitants were trained in the ways of civilization by the study of arts and letters, so that the people and Church in the Philippines were deservedly distinguished by the renown of their nation and their meritorious zeal for religion. In this way, under the direction of the kings of Spain and the patronage of the Roman Pontiffs, Catholicity was maintained with due order in the Philippine Islands. But the change which the fortunes of war have wrought in civil matters there has affected religion also; for when the Spanish yoke was removed the patronage of the Spanish kings ceased, and as a result the Church attained to a larger share of liberty, ensuring for every one rights which are safe and unassailable.

To provide against the relaxation of ecclesiastical discipline in this new state of affairs a plan of action and of organization had to be sought promptly and with great care. For this purpose we sent our venerable Brother Placide Louis Chapelle, Archbishop of New Orleans, as our Delegate Extraordinary to the Philippine Islands, who, after examining in person and putting to rights whatever would not admit of delay or postponement, was then to report to us. The duties thus imposed he has discharged faithfully in our behalf, and deserves for this reason that we should bestow on him well-merited praise. Later it happened auspiciously that the government of the United States of America undertook, by means of a special legation, to consider plans for a way of adjusting certain questions regarding Catholic interests in the Philippines. This enterprise we gladly encouraged, and by the skill and moderation of the negotiators a way has been opened for a settlement, which is to be effected on the ground itself. After hearing the opinions of some of the Holy Roman and Eminent Cardinals of the Sacred Congregation presiding over Extraordinary Affairs, we decree and declare in this Apostolical Constitution what has seemed, after long deliberation, to be most conducive for the interests of the Church in the Philippine Islands, trusting that what we, by our supreme authority ordain, may, with the civil government righteously and favorably disposed, be zealously and piously observed.

I.—ON THE NEW BOUNDARIES OF DIOCESES.

First of all, therefore, it is our intention and purpose to increase the sacred hierarchy. When the diocese of Manila had been created by Gregory XIII., as we have said, as the faithful rapidly increased in numbers, both by reason of the natives who embraced the Catholic religion and of the arrivals from Europe, Clement VIII. decided to increase the number of bishops. He therefore elevated the Church in Manila to the dignity of an Archiepiscopate, making the Bishops of the three new dioceses he created, Cebu, Caceres and Neo Segovia, suffragans to it. To these was added later in the year 1865, the Episcopal See of Jaro.

Now these dioceses are so vast that, owing to the distance by which the settlements are separated and the difficulties of travel, the bishops can scarcely visit them thoroughly without extreme labor. Wherefore it is necessary to avail ourselves of the present opportunity to reduce the dioceses already established to narrower limits, and to form new ones. Hence, keeping the archiepiscopal see of Manila, and the dioceses of Cebu, Caceres, Neo Segovia and Jaro, we add to them and create four new dioceses: Lipa, Tuguegarao,

Capiz and Zamboanga all, like the others, suffragan to the Manilan Metropolis. Moreover, in the Marian Islands, we create a Prefecture Apostolic subject, without any intermediate authority, to ourselves and to our successors.

II.—THE METROPOLITAN AND HIS SUFFRAGAN BISHOPS.

The Archbishop of Manila is the one who will bear the title of "Metropolitan" in the Philippine Islands; and all the other bishops, those who fill the old as well as those who are to occupy the newly created sees, will be subject to him, as suffragans both in rank and in name. The rights and the functions of the Metropolitan are laid down by the ecclesiastical laws already extant. As we wish that these laws be inviolably observed, so also do we wish that the bonds of holy friendship and charity between the Metropolitan and his suffragans be ever unimpaired, and grow always closer and more binding by mutual services, exchange of counsel, and especially by frequent episcopal conventions, so far as distance may permit. Concord is the mother and guardian of the greatest benefits.

III.—THE METROPOLITAN AND SUFFRAGAN CHAPTERS.

The dignity and precedence of the Metropolitan Church require that it should be honored by a College of Canons. The Delegate Apostolic will see and determine how to obtain in future the stipend for each of the Canons which hitherto was paid by the Spanish government. If, owing to the shrinkage of revenue, the number of Canons cannot be maintained as heretofore, let it be reduced so as to consist of ten at least, and retain those who are Canons by right of their office. The Archbishop may by his own unrestricted right confer the aforementioned dignities, the Canonry, and all the benefices which belong to the Metropolitan Church; except, indeed, those which either by common law are reserved to the Apostolic See, or are the gift of some other person, or are controlled by the conditions of the concursus. We earnestly desire to have colleges of canons formed in the other cathedral churches also. Until such time as this can be done, the bishops are to choose for consultors some priests, secular and religious distinguished by their piety, learning and experience in administration, as is done in other dioceses in which there is no canonical chapter. To provide for the proper dignity of the sacred ceremonies, the consultors, just mentioned, should attend the bishop when officiating. If for any reason they be prevented from so doing, the bishop will substitute others, worthy members of the clergy, both secular and religious.

IV.—VACANT SUFFRAGAN SEES.

Should it happen that any suffragan diocese, in which there is no

canonical chapter, should lose its bishop, the Metropolitan will assume its administration; should there be none, the charge will fall to the nearest bishop, with the condition, however, that a vicar be chosen as soon as possible. Meanwhile the vicar general of the deceased bishop will manage the diocese.

V.—THE SECULAR CLERGY.

Since it is proved by experience that a native clergy is most useful everywhere, the bishops must make it their care to increase the number of native priests, in such a manner, however, as to form them thoroughly in piety and character, and to make sure that they are worthy to be entrusted with ecclesiastical charges.

Let them gradually appoint to the more responsible positions those whom practical experience will prove to be more efficient. Above all things the clergy should hold to the rule that they are not to allow themselves to be mixed up in party strifes. Although it is a maxim of common law that he who fights for God should not be involved in worldly pursuits, we deem it necessary that men in holy orders in the present condition of affairs in the Philippine Islands should avoid this in a special manner. Moreover, since there is great power in harmony of sentiment for accomplishing every great useful work for the sake of religion, let all the priests, whether secular or religious, cultivate it most zealously. It is certainly proper that they who are one body of the one head Christ should not envy one another, but be of one will, loving one another with brotherly charity. To foster this charity and maintain a vigorous discipline the bishops are reminded how very useful it is to convene a synod occasionally as time and place may require. In this way there will easily be unity in thought and action. To keep the first fervor of the priests from cooling and to preserve and increase the virtues which are worthy of the priesthood, the practice of the spiritual exercises is most helpful. The bishops must therefore see that all who have been called to the vineyard of the Lord should at least every third year go into retreat in some suitable place to meditate on the eternal truths, to remove the stains contracted by worldly contamination and renew their ecclesiastical spirit. Effort must be made to have the study of the sacred sciences kept alive among the clergy by frequent exercise: "For the lips of the priest shall keep knowledge," by which he can teach the faithful, "who shall seek the law at his mouth."* For this purpose there is nothing better than to have conferences frequently, both on moral and on liturgical questions. If the difficulties of traveling, or the small number of priests, or any other similar cause prevents them from meeting for

* Malachy II., 7.

such discussions, it will be well to have those who cannot attend the conferences treat in writing the questions proposed and submit them to the bishop at the appointed time.

VI.—THE SEMINARIES.

How much the Church thinks of seminaries for the young men who are educated with a view to the priesthood, is clear from the decree of the Council of Trent, by which they were first instituted. The bishops should therefore make the most diligent effort to have one in each diocese, in which young candidates for the sacred warfare may be received and trained for a holy living and in the lower and higher sciences. It is advisable that the boys who are studying literature should occupy their own building, and the young men who, after finishing the humanities, are devoted to philosophy and theology should dwell in another. In both departments the students should remain until, if deserving, they shall have been ordained priests, and never be permitted, except for grave reasons, to return to their homes. The bishop will entrust the administration of the seminary to one of the clergy, whether secular or religious, who is distinguished for his prudence and experience in governing, and for holiness of life. The rules laid down by us and by our predecessors show very clearly in what way the studies are to be regulated in seminaries. Where there is no seminary the bishop will have candidates educated in one of the seminaries of the neighboring diocese. On no account should the bishops admit to these seminaries any but the young men who are likely to give themselves to God in holy orders. Those who wish to study for the civil professions should have other schools, if it be possible, known as episcopal institutions or colleges. Above all things the bishop, following the precept of the Apostle, is not lightly to lay hands on any one; but to raise to orders and to employ in sacred things only those who when well tried and duly advanced in science and virtue can be of credit and of service to a diocese. They are not to leave those who go out from the seminary entirely to themselves; but to keep them from idleness and from abandoning the study of the sacred sciences, it is an excellent thing to have them every year for at least five years after ordination submit to an examination in dogmatic and moral theology before men of learning and authority. Since the halls of Rome also are open to young students from the Philippines who may wish to pursue the higher studies, it will afford us much pleasure if the bishops send hither from time to time young men who may one day communicate to their fellow citizens the knowledge of religion acquired in this very centre of truth. This Holy See will do its share in the most effective way to advance the secular clergy in

higher learning and better ecclesiastical training, so that in good time it may be worthy to assume the pastoral charges now administered by the regular priests.

VII.—THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OF YOUTH AND THE MANILA UNIVERSITY.

It is not to the ecclesiastical seminaries only that the bishops are to devote their attention, the young laymen who go to other schools are also committed to their care and providence. It is therefore the duty of the consecrated bishops to make every effort that the minds of the young who are instructed in the public schools should not lack knowledge of their religion. To have it taught properly, the bishops must see and insist that the teachers are fitted for this task and that the books in use contain no errors. Since there is question of public schools, we do not wish to proceed without a word of praise well deserved for the great Lyceum of Manila, founded by the Dominicans, and authorized by Innocent X. Since it has always been distinguished for sound doctrine and excellent teachers, for the great good it has accomplished, not only do we wish that it be treated with favor by all the bishops, but besides we take it under our own care and that of our successors. Wherefore confirming absolutely the privileges and honors granted to it by the Roman Pontiffs Innocent X. and Clement XII., we bestow upon it the title of Pontifical University and wish that the academic degrees conferred by it may have the same value as the degrees given by other Pontifical Universities.

VIII.—THE REGULARS.

Yielding to the opportunities of the new order of things in that region the Holy Apostolic See has decided to make suitable provision for the religious men who look to a manner of life proper to their Institute, devoted entirely to the duties of the sacred ministry, for the advancement of public morality, the increase of Christianity and peaceful social intercourse. We recommend earnestly, therefore, to the members of the Religious Orders to discharge holily the duties which they have assumed when pronouncing their vows, "giving no offense to any man." We command them to keep their rule of cloister inviolably; and wish therefore that all should be bound by the decree issued by the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars, July 20, 1731, which Clement XIII. our predecessor confirmed by Apostolic Letters *Nuper pro parte*, August 26, the same year. The rule and boundary of the cloister are those which are laid down in another decree issued with the approbation of Pius VI. by the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith,

August 24, 1780. For the rest, the Religious who labor in the Philippines must remember to treat with great reverence and honor those whom the Holy Ghost hath placed to rule the Church of God: and bound together with the secular clergy by the closest ties of concord and charity, let them hold nothing more pressing than to work hand in hand, throwing all their energy into the work of the ministry and the building up of the body of Christ. Furthermore, to remove every element of dissension, we wish that in future in the Philippine Islands the constitution *Formandis* of Benedict XII., dated November 6, 1744, and the other *Romanos Pontifices*, May 8, 1881, in which we decided certain points in dispute between the Bishops and Missionary Regulars in England and Scotland, be observed.

IX.—THE PARISHES.

The bishops will determine what parishes are to be entrusted to pastors from the Religious Orders after conferring with the superiors of these orders. Should any question arise in this matter which cannot be settled privately the case is to be referred to the Delegate Apostolic.

X.—THE MISSIONS.

To the other means, by which the Church as teacher provides that faith and good morals and all that makes for the salvation of souls should suffer no harm must be added one of the very greatest utility, the spiritual exercises commonly known as missions. It is altogether desirable, therefore, that in each province at least one house be founded, as a dwelling for about eight religious men, whose one duty it will be to visit occasionally the towns and villages and better the people by pious exhortations. If this is so useful for the faithful, it is surely necessary for those who have not yet received the light of the Gospel. Wherever, therefore, uncivilized peoples are still buried in monstrous idolatry, the bishops and priests must know that they are bound to try to convert them. Let them, therefore, establish stations among them for priests who will act as their apostles, and not only lead the idolaters to Christian practices, but also devote themselves to the instruction of the children. These stations are to be so located that in due time they may be made Prefectures or Vicariates Apostolic. To provide those who labor in them with means for support and for the propagation of the faith, we recommend that in each diocese, without interfering with the Lyons Society for the Propagation of the Faith, special congregations of men and women be formed to manage the collection of the

alms of the faithful and hand over the contributions to the bishops, to be distributed entirely and equally to the missions.

XI.—ECCLESIASTICAL DISCIPLINE.

To win the esteem of the faithful there is no better way than for the clergy to do in effect what as priests they preach. For, since, as the Council of Trent says, they are regarded as removed above worldly things to a higher plane, others lift their eyes to them for a model and imitate what they get from them. Wherefore it is highly

proper that priests should so regulate all their manners that in their dress, carriage, walk, conversation, and in all things they may appear grave, moderate and altogether religious; they should avoid even lighter faults, which in them are serious, so that all their actions may inspire veneration. It is for this restoration of ecclesiastical discipline and for the full execution of this Constitution we have sent our Venerable Brother John Baptist Guidi, Archbishop of Staupolis, as Extraordinary Delegate Apostolic to the Philippine Islands, carrying thither our person. In him we have conferred all necessary faculties; and we have given him besides our mandate to convene and hold a provincial Synod, as soon as circumstances permit.

XII.—ON PEACE AND REVERENCE FOR THOSE IN AUTHORITY.

It remains for us now only to address ourselves with paternal charity to all the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands, and to exhort them with all the persuasion in our power to maintain union in the bonds of peace. This the duty of our Christian profession requires: "For greater is the brotherhood in Christ, than of blood: for the brotherhood of blood means only a likeness of body, but brotherhood in Christ is unanimity in heart and in soul, as it is written in Acts iv., 32, 'and the multitude of believers had but one heart and one soul.'" This, too, is required for the good of religion, which is the chief source and ground of the praiseworthy things which have distinguished the Philippine peoples in the past. This, finally, is required by a sincere love of country, which will derive nothing but loss and destruction from public disturbances. Let them reverence those who exercise authority, according to the Apostle, "for all power is from God." And although separated from us by the broad expanse of ocean, let them know that they are one in faith with the Apostolic See, which embraces them with special affection and will never abandon its charge of protecting their interests.

[Here follow the usual affirmation of the validity of this Constitution, and the penalties for disobeying or opposing it.]

ENCYCLICAL LETTER OF HIS HOLINESS LEO XIII., BY
DIVINE PROVIDENCE POPE.

TO THE BISHOPS OF ITALY.

LEO PP. XIII.

Venerable Brethren, Health and Apostolic Benediction.

FROM the beginning of our Pontificate having gravely considered the serious conditions of society, we are not slow to recognize, as one of the most urgent duties of the Apostolic office, that of devoting a most special care to the education of the clergy.

We see in fact that all our designs to bring about a restoration of Christian life among our people, would be in vain if in the ecclesiastical state the sacerdotal spirit was not preserved intact and vigorous. This we have not ceased to do, as far as was possible to us, both with institutions and writings directed to that end. And now a particular solicitude regarding the clergy of Italy moves us, venerable brethren, again to treat on this subject of so great importance. It is true, beautiful and continued testimonies have been shown of learning, piety and zeal, among which we are glad to praise the alacrity with which, seconding the impulse and direction of their bishops, they coöperate in that Catholic movement which we have so much at heart. We cannot altogether, however, hide the preoccupation of our soul at seeing for some time past a certain desire of innovation insinuating itself here and there, as regards the constitution as well as the multiform actions of the sacred ministry. Now it is easy to foresee the grave consequences which we should have to deplore if a speedy remedy were not applied to this innovating tendency.

Therefore, in order to preserve the Italian clergy from the pernicious influences of the times, we deem it opportune, venerable brethren, to recall in this our letter, the true and invariable principles that should regulate ecclesiastical education and the entire sacred ministry. The Catholic priesthood—divine in its origin, supernatural in its essence, immutable in its character, is not an institution that can accommodate itself with ease to human systems and opinions. A participation of the eternal priesthood of Jesus Christ, it must perpetuate even to the consummation of ages the same mission that the Eternal Father confided to His Incarnate Word: “Sicut misit me Pater, et ego mitto vos.” To work the eternal salvation of souls will always be the great commandment of

which it must never fall short, as to faithfully fulfil it, it must never cease to have recourse to those supernatural aids and those divine rules of thought and of action which Jesus Christ gave His Apostles when He sent them throughout the whole world to convert the nations to the Gospel. Therefore St. Paul in his letters reminds us that the priest can never be anything but the legate, the minister of Christ, the dispenser of His mysteries, and he represents him to us as dwelling in a high place, as a mediator between heaven and earth, to treat with God, about the supreme interests of the human race, which are those of everlasting life. The idea that holy books give us of the Christian priesthood, is that it is a supernatural institution superior to all those of earth, and as far separated from them as the divine is from the human.

This same high idea is clearly brought out by the works of the Fathers, the laws of the Roman Pontiffs, and the Bishops, by the decrees of the Councils, and by the unanimous teaching of the Doctors and of the Catholic schools. Above all, the tradition of the Church with one voice proclaims that the priest is another Christ, and that the priesthood though exercised on earth merits to be numbered among the orders of heaven; because it is given to them to administer things that are wholly celestial and upon them is conferred a power that God has not trusted even to the angels; a power and ministry which regard the government of souls, and which is the art of arts. Therefore, education, studies, customs, and whatever comprises the sacerdotal discipline have always been considered by the Church as belonging entirely to herself, not merely distinct, but altogether separate from the ordinary rules of secular life. This distinction and separation must, therefore, remain unaltered, even in our own times, and any tendency to accommodate or confound the ecclesiastical life and education with the secular life and education must be considered as reprov'd, not only by the traditions of Christian ages, but by the apostolic doctrine itself and the ordinances of Jesus Christ.

Certainly in the formation of the clergy and the sacerdotal ministry, it is reasonable that regard should be had to the varied conditions of the times. Therefore we are far from rejecting the idea of such changes as would render the work of the clergy still more efficacious in the society in which they live, and it is for that reason that it has seemed necessary to us to promote among them a more solid and finished culture, and to open a still wider field to their ministry; but every other innovation which could in any way prejudice what is essential to the priest must be regarded as altogether blameworthy. The priest is above all constituted master, physician and shepherd of souls, and a guide to an end not enclosed within the

bounds of this present life. Now he can never fully correspond if he is not well versed in the science of divine and sacred things, if he is not furnished with that piety which makes a man of God; and if he does not take every care to render his teachings valuable by the efficacy of his example, conformably to the admonition given to the sacred pastor by the Prince of the Apostles: "Forma facti gregis ex animo." For those who watch the times and the changeable condition of society, these are the right and the greatest gifts that could shine in the Catholic priest, together with the principles of faith; every other quality natural and human would certainly be commendable, but would not have with regard to the sacerdotal office anything but secondary and relative importance. If, therefore, it is reasonable and just that the clergy should accommodate themselves as far as is permitted to the needs of the present age, it is still more necessary that the present depravity of the century should not be yielded to, but strongly resisted; and this while corresponding naturally to the high end of the priesthood, will also render their ministry still more fruitful by increasing its dignity, and therefore gaining it respect. It is seen everywhere how the spirit of naturalism tends to penetrate every part of the social body, even the most healthy; a spirit which fills the minds with pride and causes them to rebel against every authority; depraves the heart and turns it after the desire of earthly goods, neglecting those eternal.

It is greatly to be feared that some influence of this spirit, so evil, and already so widely diffused, might insinuate itself even among ecclesiastics, particularly among those of less experience. What sad effects would not arise if that gravity of conduct which belongs to the priest, should be in any way lessened; if he should yield with lightness to the charm of every novelty; if he should deport himself with pretentious indocility towards his superiors; if he should lose that weight and measure in discussion which is so necessary, particularly in matters of faith and morals.

Would it not be a still more deplorable thing, causing as it would the ruin of Christian people, if he, in the sacred ministry of the pulpit, should introduce language not conformable to his character of a preacher of the Gospel? Moved by such considerations we feel it our duty again and still more warningly to recommend that above all things the Seminaries should with jealous care keep up a proper spirit with regard to the education of the mind as well as to that of the heart. They must never lose sight of the fact that they are exclusively destined to prepare young men not for merely human offices, however praiseworthy and honorable, but for that higher mission, which we lately spoke of, as ministers of Christ and dispensers of the mysteries of God. From such a reflection altogether

supernatural, it will be easy, as we have already said in our Encyclical to the clergy of France, dated September 8, 1899, to draw precious rules, not merely for the correct education of clerics, but also to remove far from the institutes in which they are educated, every danger, whether external or internal, or of a moral or religious order.

With respect to the studies, in order that the clergy should not be strangers to the advancement of all good discipline, everything that is truly useful or good will be recognized in the new methods; every age can contribute to the knowledge of human learning. However, we desire that on this subject, great attention shall be paid to our prescriptions regarding the study of classic literature, principally philosophy, theology, and the like sciences—prescriptions which we have given in many writings, chiefly in the above-mentioned Encyclical, of which we send you an extract, together with the present. It would certainly be desirable that the young ecclesiastics should all follow the course of studies always under the shadow of the sacred institutes. However, as grave reasons sometimes render it necessary that some of them should frequent the public universities, let it not be forgotten with what and how great caution bishops should permit this.

We desire likewise that they should insist on the faithful observance of the rules contained in a still more recent document, which in a particular manner regards the lectures on anything else that could give occasion to the young men to take part in external agitations. Thus the students of the seminaries, treasuring up this time, so precious and full of the greatest tranquillity for their souls, will be able to devote themselves entirely to those studies which will render them fitted for the grand duties of the priesthood, particularly that of the ministry of preaching and the confessional. They should reflect well on the gravity of the responsibilities of those priests who in spite of the great need of the Christian people neglect to devote themselves to the exercise of the sacred ministry, and of those also who, not bringing to it an enlightened zeal for both the one and the other, correspond sadly with their vocation in things which are of the greatest importance in the salvation of souls.

Here we must call your attention, venerable brethren, to the special instruction which we wish given regarding the ministry of the Divine Word; and from which we desire they should draw copious fruit. With respect to the ministry of the confession: let them remember how severe are the words of the most enlightened and mildest of moralists towards those who, without purifying their own souls, do not hesitate to seat themselves in the tribunal of Penance, and how not less severe is the lament of the late great Pontiff, Benedict XIV., who numbers among the greatest calamities of the Church

the defect in confessors of a science, both theological and moral, added to the gravity that such a holy office requires.

To the noble end of preparing worthy ministers of the Lord, it is necessary, venerable brethren, to watch with an ever-increasing vigor and vigilance not only over the scientific instruction, but also over the disciplinary and educative systems of your seminaries. Do not accept young men other than those who exhibit well-founded desires of consecrating themselves for ever to the ecclesiastical ministry. Keep them removed from contact and still more from living together with youths who are not aspiring to the sacred ministry. Such intercourse may, for certain just and grave reasons, be allowed for a time, and with great caution, until they can be properly provided for according to the spirit of ecclesiastical discipline. Those who during the course of their education shall manifest tendencies little suited to the priestly vocation, must be dismissed, and in admitting clerics to the sacred orders the utmost discretion must be used, according to the grave admonition of St. Paul to Timothy, "*Manus cito nemini imposueris.*" In this matter it is only right that every consideration should be put on one side that is inferior to the most important one of the dignity of the sacred ministry. It is, therefore, of the greatest importance that in order to render the pupils of the sanctuary living images of Jesus Christ (which is the end of ecclesiastical education), that the directors and teachers should unite to the diligent fulfilment of their office the example of a truly priestly life. The exemplary conduct of those in authority is, especially to young men, the most eloquent and persuasive language to inspire in their souls the conviction of their own duties and the love of virtue.

A work of such importance requires from the directors of souls a more than ordinary prudence and an indefatigable care; and it is our desire that this office, which we wish should not be lacking in any seminary, should be confided to an ecclesiastic of great experience in the ways of Christian perfection. It can never be sufficiently recommended to him to found and cultivate in his pupils that piety which is for all, but especially for the clergy, of the greatest fruitfulness and inestimable utility. Therefore, he will be solicitous to warn them against a pernicious snare not unfrequent among young men—that of giving themselves so entirely and with such ardor to their studies as to neglect their advancement in the science of the saints. The deeper root piety has taken in clerics' souls, so much the more will they be filled with that strong spirit of sacrifice which is altogether necessary to work for the divine glory in the salvation of souls. Thanks be to God, there are not lacking among the Italian clergy priests who give noble proof of what a minister of God, pene-

trated with that spirit, can do; wonderful, indeed, is the generosity of many who to spread the Kingdom of Jesus Christ voluntarily hasten to distant countries, there to encounter fatigues, privations and hardships of every kind and even martyrdom itself.

In this manner, aided by loving care and fitting culture of soul and mind, step by step the young Levite will be brought up to recognize both the sanctity of his vocation and the needs of the Christian people. The training, 'tis true, is not short; and yet it is to be wished that the time in the seminary could be prolonged. It is necessary, indeed, that the young priests are not left without guidance in their first labors, but should be strengthened by the experience of their seniors, who will ripen their zeal, their prudence and their piety; and it is expedient also that either with academic exercises or with periodical conferences they should be encouraged to continue with their sacred studies.

It is plain, venerable brethren, that what we have here recommended will aid in a singular manner that social usefulness of the clergy which we have on many occasions inculcated as necessary to our times. Therefore, by exacting the faithful observance of those rules this usefulness will draw therefrom its spirit and life.

We repeat again, and still more warmly, that the clergy go to a Christian people tempted on every side, and with every kind of fallacious promise offered by Socialism to apostatize from the true faith. They must therefore submit all their actions to the authority of those whom the Holy Spirit has constituted Bishops, to rule the Church of God, without which would follow confusion and the most grave disorders to the detriment even of the cause they have at heart to defend and promote. It is for this end that we desire that the candidates for the priesthood, on the conclusion of their education in the seminary, should be suitably instructed in the pontifical documents relating to the social question, and the Christian democracy, abstaining, however, as we have already said, from taking any part whatever in the external movement. When they are made priests they will direct themselves with particular care to the people, always the object of the Church's loving care. They will raise the children of the people from the ignorance of things both spiritual and eternal, and with industrious tenderness they will lead them to an honest and virtuous life. They will strengthen the adults in their faith, dissipating the contrary prejudices and confirm them in the practices of Christian life. They will promote among the Catholic laity those institutions which they will recognize as really efficacious in the moral and material improvement of the multitude. Above all they will propose to them the principles of justice and evangelical charity, to which are equally united all the rights and duties of civil and social

life, such should be the way in which they fulfil their noble part in the social action.

Let them, however, have it always present to their minds that the priest even in the midst of his people must preserve intact his august character as a minister of God, being as he is placed at the head of his brethren. Any manner whatever, in which he employs himself among the people, to the loss of the sacerdotal dignity, or with danger to the ecclesiastical duties and discipline, can only be warmly reproved.

This, then, venerable brethren, is what the conscience of the Apostolic Office has imposed on us to make known, regarding the present condition of the Italian clergy. We do not doubt that in a thing of such gravity and importance you will add your zealous and loving care to our solicitude, inspired thereto especially by the bright example of the great Archbishop, St. Charles Borromeo. Therefore, to give effect to our admonitions, make them the subject of your diocesan conferences, and inform yourselves on such means as are necessary according to the needs of your respective dioceses. To all these designs and deliberations you will not lack the aid of our authority.

And now, with words that rise from the depths of our fatherly heart, we turn to you, priests of Italy, and recommend to each and all of you to use every effort to correspond still more worthily with your high vocation. To you, ministers of Christ, we can say with more reason than did St. Paul to the mere faithful, "*Obsecro itaque vos ego vinctus in Domino, ut digne ambuletis vocatione qua vocati estis.*" The love of our common mother the Church renews and reinvigorates between you that concord of thought and action which redoubles the strength and renders the work more fruitful. In these times, so dangerous to religion and society, when the clergy of every nation are called on to unite together in defense of the Faith and Christian morals, it belongs to you, beloved sons, joined by a special bond to this Apostolic See, to give to all an example and be the first in unlimited obedience to the voice and command of the Vicar of Jesus Christ; and so may the blessing of God which we invoke descend copiously and preserve the Italian clergy ever worthy of their illustrious traditions.

May the Apostolic Benediction be a pledge of the divine favor which, with the affection of our heart, we impart to you and to the entire clergy trusted to your care.

Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, on the Sacred day of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, December 8, 1902, in the twenty-fifth year of our Pontificate.

LEO, P.P., XIII.

PAPAL ALLOCUTION ON CHRISTIAN DEMOCRACY.

(Addressed to the Cardinals on December 23, 1902.)

WE shall not employ many words, Venerable Brethren, to express our gratitude for the devoted sentiments uttered in the name of all by the revered Cardinal, the Dean of your College. But this we cannot leave unsaid, that to-day more than ever, we repose our confidence in your united devotedness. Well-deserving coöperators for so long a time, you accompany us still with strenuous affection, even though the roughness of the road be increasing.

This year of Jubilee, the occasion of your courteous congratulations and of the unceasing demonstrations of love of the whole Christian world, is passing, as you see, embittered by social events, altogether too sorrowful for the heart of a Pontiff. The cause of the Church and of the Christian Name having been thwarted in a hundred ways, there is now a bolder attempt, to undermine, under the pretext of law, the sacred institutions of Christianity. But are not those a portion, and the choicest, of the heritage left by Christ to the nations redeemed, and ordained expressly for the guardianship and ward of the sovereign benefits of morality, the chief source of all other benefits to human society? False is the desire of public prosperity and of civil development, which inspires the doers of deeds like these! What is intended and sought is, in truth, the ruin of the Christian order of society and the reconstruction of States on the basis of a pagan naturalism. If it be written in heaven that amid such sorrows our day of life must end, we shall close our weary eyes in resignation, blessing God; but with this conviction planted most firmly in our heart, that, when the hour of mercy shall have come, He Himself will arise for the healing of the nations, assigned as an inheritance to the Only-Begotten of God.

Your last words allude, Lord Cardinal, to the social action of Christian Democracy, which has become to-day, as you fully understand, a fact of no slight importance. To this action, so entirely consonant to the spirit of our time and to the needs which called it forth, we gave sanction and impulse, defining clearly and distinctively its scope, its method, and its limitations; so that, if in this regard any one make a mistake, he cannot allege as an excuse that our authoritative guidance was wanting. But speaking in general of those who have become engaged in this work, Italians as well as others, it is undeniable that they labor therein with excellent zeal and notable results: nor may we allow to pass unnoticed the active

part that hundreds of noble-hearted young men have taken in it. We have encouraged the clergy also to enter this same field of action; for, in truth, there is no enterprise of sincere charity, judicious and beneficial, which is foreign to the vocation of the Catholic priesthood. And is not this true and most opportune charity, to apply oneself with care and disinterestedness to the betterment of the spiritual condition as well as the material circumstances of the multitude? The maternal love of the Church for mankind is as wide as the paternity of God; but, nevertheless, faithful to her origin, and mindful of the Divine example, she has been always accustomed to devote herself by predilection to the lowly, to the afflicted, to the disinherited of fortune. When it is sincerely and constantly animated by the spirit of this universal mother of peoples, Christian Democracy need have no fear of failing in its scope; nor need any one have fear of the name when he knows that the thing is good. Understood as the Church understands it, the democratic concept not only accords marvelously with the dictates of revelation and religious belief, but has even been born of Christianity and educated by it, and it is by the preaching of the Gospel that the nations have received it. Athens and Rome knew it not, before they heard the Divine Voice which said to men, "You are all brothers, and of one Father who is in heaven."

Outside of this democracy, which is called and which is Christian, there is a seditious and Godless democracy, which pursues other ideals and walks by other ways; and bitter are the days which it is preparing for the States which hatch it in their bosoms and caress it. But our popular Christian movement, extending itself to the same objects, is an antagonistic force which bars the way of success for the other, and is frequently able to anticipate its work. If our Christian movement does nothing more than contest the field with socialistic democracy, and circumscribe the pernicious influences of this latter, it will have rendered a service, by no means unimportant, to social order and Christian polity.

In affectionate exchange of good wishes, we implore from heaven the choicest blessings on the Sacred College, and of them may this be an omen which with warmth of heart we impart to you, extending it to the Bishops, to the various Prelates, and to all others who are gathered about us.

Scientific Chronicle.

THE ABSOLUTE ZERO.

According to the kinetic theory of matter, which is at present universally accepted by physicists, the molecule, which is the unit mass of matter with which the physicist deals, is in a state of motion and its energy, usually termed heat, is the molecular energy, due to this small mass of matter in virtue of its motion. According to this theory the expansion of a mass of matter is due to the fact that the path of vibration of these molecules is enlarged, that is, their energy is increased by increasing their velocity, contraction is due to the shortening of the path of vibration, which means the cooling of the body.

The kinetic theory, moreover, explains the pressure of gases on the walls of containing vessels by stating that the pressure is due to the impact of these vibrating molecules on the sides of the vessel. It is a bombardment of the small molecules which is so rapid as to produce a continuous pressure on the containing walls. This pressure is increased with an increase of temperature and reduced with a reduction in temperature. The force of this pressure is dependent on the increase of volume of the gas. By accurate measurements it has been determined that a gas expands or contracts for an increase or decrease of one degree of temperature the one-two-hundred and seventy-third part of its volume. So that if we started with a gas at zero temperature and could cool it to minus 273 degrees centigrade the motion of the molecules would cease, that is there would be no heat in it.

We have never reached this temperature, and it is one of the problems of science whether we shall ever be able to reach it and determine the behavior of matter at this absolute zero temperature. One of the most successful workers in this field of investigation is Professor Dewar, who, in his presidential address at the Belfast meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, gave a summary of the present condition of scientific research in the production of very low temperatures. The great problem to be solved in the reaching of very low temperatures is not so much the cooling as the preserving the low temperature when obtained, that is, the preventing the influx of heat from surrounding bodies.

Professor Dewar solved this problem himself. He kept the liquefied gases in vessels with double walls and the annular space

between the walls was very highly exhausted. A coating of silver on the inner walls also reduced the influx of heat.

A further step was made by the counter-current apparatus of Linde, thus uniting to mechanical compression the cooling action of an expanding gas. This made liquid air possible and using liquid air as a new refrigerating agent an attack was made on hydrogen which was liquefied by Dewar in 1898. Thus Professor Dewar speaks of liquid hydrogen: "Liquid hydrogen is a colorless transparent body of extraordinary intrinsic interest. It has a clearly defined surface, is easily seen, drops well, in spite of the fact that its surface tension is only the thirty-fifth part of that of water, or about one-fifth that of liquid air, and can be poured easily from vessel to vessel. The liquid does not conduct electricity, and, if anything, is slightly diamagnetic. Compared with an equal volume of liquid air, it requires only one-fifth the quantity of heat for vaporization; on the other hand, its specific heat is ten times that of liquid air or five times that of water.

"It is by far the lightest liquid known to exist, its density being only one-fourteenth that of water; the lightest liquid previously known was liquid marsh gas, which is six times heavier. The only solid which has so small density as to float upon its surface is a piece of pith wood. It is by far the coolest liquid known. At ordinary atmospheric pressure it boils at minus 252.5 degrees or 20.5 degrees absolute. The vapor of the hydrogen arising from the liquid has nearly the density of air—that is, it is fourteen times that of the gas at the ordinary temperature. Reduction of the pressure by an air pump brings down the temperature to minus 258 degrees, when the liquid becomes a solid resembling frozen foam, and this by further exhaustion is cooled to minus 260 degrees or 13 degrees absolute, which is the lowest steady temperature that has been reached. The solid may also be got in the form of a clear transparent ice, melting at about 15 degrees absolute, under a pressure of 55 mm., possessing the unique density of one-eleventh that of water. Such cold involves the solidification of every gaseous substance but one that is at present definitely known to the chemist, and so liquid hydrogen introduces the investigator to a world of solid bodies."

If any further advance is to be made towards the absolute zero it can only be done by finding some gas that is more volatile than hydrogen, and such a gas is helium. This gas has not yet been liquefied, but it may be, and if so, the temperature of liquefaction will be lower than that of hydrogen. A sufficiently low temperature may be reached by use of liquid hydrogen, but if not it will undoubtedly be secured by the additional expenditure of mechanical energy absorbing heat by the performance of external work. In

any event it is probable that there exist gases other than helium of greater volatility than hydrogen; and it is extremely improbable, in the opinion of Professor Dewar, that the absolute zero will ever be reached by man.

Although these investigations in quest of low temperatures are confined to the laboratory, the same was one day true of the researches of Faraday in electricity and magnetism, and to-day they form the foundation of the whole of modern electrical engineering.

BUREAU OF FORESTRY.

The Division of Forestry of the Department of Agriculture has been raised to the rank of a regular Government Bureau. The importance of this step will be fully appreciated when we recall the rate at which our wooded lands are being depleted and the consequent necessity of preserving and if possible increasing their extent.

A thorough study of the timber question reveals the fact that the annual natural income of timber does not equal the output and that we are daily drawing on the surplus of the past. This becomes a serious question when we consider not only the effect on the climate, the rainfall and the floods that result, but also when we consider the effect on home industry and foreign trade. One item alone will bring to our minds the enormous consumption of wood. Our newspapers, magazines and books are printed on paper made from wood pulp, and acres of virgin woodland are required for a single issue of a metropolitan daily or a leading magazine. Our exports are growing, and manufactured articles that require wood form a large part of them. Lumber is sent across the Atlantic in shiploads, our paper goes to Europe and Australia by millions of pounds, American carriages and furniture are largely used in Europe, our railway and trolley cars are purchased in South America, New Zealand and in Asia, and American wood and pulp manufactures are used the world over. Add to this American agricultural machinery which is in universal demand and we can form some idea of the rate at which our forests are being depleted.

The fact that the country is awake to the problem that confronts it is clear from the response that was universally given to the offer made by the Division of Forestry in 1898. This was an offer of expert services to advise and make plans for the management of woodlands. The response came from every State and Territory in the country and summed up embraced an area of 3,500,000 acres.

Another hopeful feature is recognized in the specific trend of American industrial life. The large corporations in every department of industry are producing not only the finished product but also the raw material, and thereby cheapening the cost of production. This same tendency is seen among paper manufacturers who are large consumers of wood. If they deplete the forest from which they take the wood they must move their mill, which means a large money loss. They are therefore obliged to take care of their woodlands that they may have a constant supply of wood for their paper pulp. So interested have some of these firms become in the preservation of the woods that although they control thousands of acres of forest they will not fell a tree that is under a foot in diameter, thus enabling them to use their pulp mill and forest indefinitely. They moreover employ skilled foresters to care for the trees.

Among the large consumers of timber must be reckoned the railroads. They require the wood for ties and telegraph poles, and as no satisfactory substitute has been found for wood as a railroad tie its increasing price is forcing the railroad companies to become practical timber growers, and in recent meetings of railroad managers there have been earnest discussions on the advisability of regular tree planting and cultivation on land secured for that purpose. This action by these companies opens up a field for trained foresters. The manufacturers of agricultural implements are adopting the same policy and some already have large tracts of woodland skillfully managed under advice received from the Division of Forestry.

The lumber companies are slower to adopt the scientific plan of staying by one tract of forest land and caring for it; still there is a gain in this direction, for in the Adirondacks, for example, it has been found profitable to adopt the advice of the Bureau and cut only trees above a certain size and to so do the work that the younger growth is not injured. Measures are also taken to guard against forest fires. Thus the forest is preserved for a steady yield for hundreds of years.

The Government of the United States has forest reserves amounting to about fifty millions of acres. To care for these government reserves and for the large woodland tracts controlled by corporations men skilled in forestry are required, and it has been the aim of the Bureau of Forestry to encourage in our colleges courses that will fit competent men to undertake this work in an intelligent way, and while making a good livelihood, protect and develop this important source of many industries in the country. At present there are forest schools in Yale, Cornell, Biltmore, N. C., and in many of the universities of the Middle West. The importance of this work cannot be overestimated, and now that it is being put on a scientific

basis we can look forward to the preservation of our forests that means so much for the material development of the nation.

INTERNAL COMBUSTION MOTORS.

Although we have internal combustion motors of different types, still there is a field for one requiring little or no water and burning a heavy oil. This fact was brought out in trials of military automobiles made by a committee of the British War Office. The experience that the army met with in South Africa proved the necessity of providing some power other than animal to haul supplies and arms over long distances. Machines propelled by steam were most numerous among those tested. Steam means a waste of fuel and demands a supply of water. The same difficulties that are encountered in animal haulage would also be met with in this method. Again, the supply of fuel would have to be hauled, and this would absorb too high a percentage of the capacity of this kind of motive power to make it practical. Hence an internal combustion engine requiring no water and burning heavy oil is recommended. The light oils are considered too dangerous on account of their volatility.

Another field for such motors is suggested by the recent successful trials of the two new submarine torpedo boats, the "Moccasin" and the "Adder," built for the United States Navy. What seems to be clearly proved by these tests is that there has been a decided gain in the control of the boat while it was submerged, and hence that in this direction the question of submarine navigation is solved. There remains, however, the question of motive power. Along this line the further advance in the torpedo boat will certainly be made. The present submarines use gasoline engines for motive power when running on the surface and for charging the storage batteries. In this arrangement there are two sources of danger, one from the fuel employed in the engine and the other from the gases that are liberated from the lead type of storage battery employed. An internal combustion motor burning a heavy oil would obviate the first difficulty, while the use of a storage battery of the Edison type, from which no gas arises, would correct the other. While the principal use of the submarine boat in this country will undoubtedly be in the line of harbor and coast defense, its field will be enlarged to that of a means of attack in European countries where the coasts are not so far apart. The field of the internal combustion motor is correspondingly increased and will no doubt stimulate the inventors to attack the problem of such a motor burning heavy oil.

The smoke question which is attracting so much attention also suggests a field for a motor such as we speak of. The solution of this question means the purification of the atmosphere, and the only feasible way of doing it is by preventing the pollution of the atmosphere. Hundreds of tons of solid refuse are daily projected into the atmosphere of some of our large cities where soft coal is used, and may be seen in the dense black columns of coal dust that rise from the chimneys. The prohibition of the use of soft coal in large cities is not practical on account of the limited supply of smokeless anthracite. Smoke consumers, while they have brought some little alleviation, are not a remedy. The direction then in which we are to look for a cure is the internal combustion engine. Engines of this type exist, but they use the light and volatile oils, and hence are always accompanied with the serious element of danger which prevents their general adoption. What is needed is an internal combustion engine that will consume the heavy non-volatile oils, and certainly the field of usefulness for such an engine is large, even if we do not take into account the item of economy in fuel. Of course this would only remove the smoke from factories; the smoke from private residences could be prevented by the introduction of gas as a fuel.

MARCONI'S TRIUMPH.

On Sunday, December 21, Sig. Marconi announced to the world through the Associated Press that he had succeeded in sending complete messages by wireless telegraphy from his station at Cape Breton to his station in Cornwall, England. This is the text of the dispatch sent by him from Glace Bay, N. S., to the Associated Press: "I beg to inform you for circulation that I have established wireless telegraph communication between Cape Breton and Cornwall, Eng., with complete success. Inauguratory messages, including one from the Governor General of Canada to King Edward, have already been transmitted and forwarded to the Kings of England and Italy. A message to the *London Times* has also been transmitted in the presence of its special correspondent, Dr. Parkin, M. P."

On Sunday, December 21, the station at Table Head was early the scene of suppressed anxiety and controlled nervousness, if we are to believe the descriptions given in the daily press. No doubt there was something of this feeling in the breasts of those who were about to give to the world by a practical test the commercial application of some of the finest results of electrical science. At an early hour Cornwall was called up and the first message was sent. There

was a pause. Did it connect? It did. The answer came. Several other messages were sent.

The announcement of the work accomplished on Sunday came in the nature of a surprise, for Christmas day had been announced as the occasion of the grand opening of the station at Cape Breton. From early morning until about 1 o'clock Marconi remained at the station with doors locked and the gate to the grounds guarded by sentinels. Before leaving the station he sent the message given above.

Following this triumph comes the news of his success at Cape Cod. From South Wellfleet, Mass., we learn that the following message was sent by the Marconi system of wireless telegraph, from that station on January 19 last:

His Majesty, Edward VII., London, England:

In taking advantage of the wonderful triumph of scientific research and ingenuity which has been achieved in perfecting a system of wireless telegraphy, I extend on behalf of the American people most cordial greetings and good wishes to you and to all the people of the British Empire.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

Wellfleet, Mass., January 19, 1903.

The King's reply was by cable, as the station at Cornwall, Eng., is not powerful enough to send messages so far. The intention is to bring this station up to proper power and then to open up for business. With a view to doing this intelligently Marconi is at present experimenting on the minimum of power required to transmit a message across the Atlantic. At Glace Bay they use a current of 100,000 volts, while at the Cape Cod station they are using one of only 50,000 volts, not that all this is required to reach Cornwall. It has been announced by the manager of the company that not more than one-sixth of the available power was used in sending the President's message.

The power of the station in England is to be increased, and when that has been done we may expect to see wireless telegraphy enter the commercial world in the struggle for existence. The promise of survival seems to be well founded.

When these stations are completed there will be work for a large staff of expert telegraphers and mechanics, and they expect to be able to transmit messages at the rate of one thousand words per hour.

ALLOYS OF ALUMINUM.

While many uses have been found for the metal aluminum, still its place in construction as a simple metal has not been as extensive as was at first thought it would be. This was due to the fact that

while its specific gravity was only about one-third that of steel, still as a structural material it was about equivalent, weight for weight, to steel, since its tensile strength is only one-third that of steel.

The chief field of utility is in the manufacture of alloys, many of which are now in extensive use. To determine the properties of many of these alloys was the object of a series of experiments undertaken by M. Leon Guillet and described by him in the Bulletin of the Society for the Encouragement of National Industries. Apart from the knowledge of the properties of these alloys, the method of preparing them is of interest.

The oxide of the metal to be alloyed with aluminum was first prepared in the form of a fine powder. This was then mixed with aluminum in fine grains and thoroughly washed with ether to remove all traces of grease. The mixture was then packed in a crucible and ignited by a fuse made of a mixture of aluminum powder and binoxide of barium touched off by a match. When the fused mass had cooled the crucible was broken and a mass of the alloy of the metal reduced from its oxide and a portion of the aluminum was found encased in crystals of corundum. This was then polished and its composition and properties examined.

A few of these may be briefly mentioned. Alloys of aluminum and tungsten containing more than 58 per cent. of the latter proved very hard but also exceedingly brittle. The same was also found true of the alloys with molybdenum, and when they contained high percentages of aluminum there was a tendency to crumble rapidly to a powder. The alloys with tin were malleable and readily crushed, while those with uranium were hard and brittle. With iron and with manganese alloys that were quite malleable were obtained, while with nickel and with cobalt the hardness of the alloy depended on the percentage of these latter metals alloyed with the aluminum—eighty-three per cent. of the former and eighty-seven of the latter giving the hardest alloy.

While this is research work on the part of M. Guillet, it will no doubt have practical results in many lines of industry. The soft alloys may find application for bearings and hard ones for dies for stamping metal so that the dies may be cast and not cut and hardened as is the case now with steel.

TWO FAMOUS EXPERIMENTS REPEATED.

All students of astronomy are familiar with Foucault's famous pendulum experiment to show the rotation of the earth on its axis.

The French astronomer Flammarion has lately repeated this experiment under the same conditions under which it was made fifty years ago. Foucault in 1851 suspended a pendulum made of a heavy weight, supported by a wire, from the interior of the dome of the Pantheon in Paris. The pendulum always keeping the same plane of vibration, the rotation of the earth was indicated by the movement of the pavement beneath with respect to that plane. The experiments of Foucault were interrupted by the political disturbances of the times and were abandoned. In this successful repetition of the experiment the apparent rotation of the plane of vibration of the pendulum, indicating the actual rotation of the earth on its axis, agreed accurately with the computations.

The other experiment which is now repeating is that of determining the density of the earth by means of comparing the vibration of pendulums upon and beneath the surface of the earth. In 1856 Airy tried this experiment at a colliery in Wales. One pendulum swung at the surface of the earth and the other at the bottom of a pit 1,256 feet deep. Great care was taken to obtain accurate results, but still they differed materially from the deductions drawn from the laws of gravitation and did not aid in settling the question. The present repetition of the experiment is under the charge of Major Hayford, of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, and is being carried on at the Tamarack Mine, near Calumet, Michigan. It is expected that much more accurate results will be obtained in this repetition of the experiment as the shaft at this mine is 4,550 feet deep. The results of this experiment are awaited with much interest.

D. T. O'SULLIVAN, S. J.

Boston, Mass.

Book Reviews.

PAUL ALLARD: JULIEN L'APOSTAT. Tome I., pp. iv., 504. Tome II., pp. 376. Tome III., pp. 416. Paris: Victor Lecoffre, 90 Rue Bonaparte. 1903.

M. Allard has linked his name inseparably with the history of early Christianity. No other writer has described so vividly and so attractively what might be called the *relational* life of the early Church—her relations social and political to the Roman Empire, to the institution of slavery and to pagan art. But the work for which he will probably be longest and most gratefully remembered is the five volumes in which he has unfolded the history of the persecutions from their outbreak, to their cessation and the triumph of the Church under Constantine. The honors bestowed by the French Academy on the second portion of this work at its first appearance might well have been extended to its entirety, which, however, for the rest, is crowned in the appreciation and grateful remembrance of all who have read it.

The present work on *Julian the Apostate*, though quite independent on its own account, has its subject matter closely enough connected with the Constantinian triumph to form a consecutive series with the last volume on the final persecution. As indicated in the title above, the work comprises three volumes. Almost half of the first volume is devoted to two pictures, the one of paganism—its teachings and its material and legal situation—the other of society during the fourth century. The latter will be found especially interesting to the student of ecclesiastical history, for its comprehensive presentation of the social and political position of the bishop and clergy of the time. The chapters dealing with the organization of society especially in what concerns the middle and the laboring classes will have a particular suggestiveness to those interested in political economy. Though these pictures have an individual value their bearing on the enigmatical personage of Julian is of main importance, for, as M. Allard well observes, without a precise and detailed apprehension of the epoch in which he lived it is difficult to understand the attempt of Julian to turn back the stream of his time, or to estimate the special character of the ephemeral reaction towards paganism with which his name will remain forever associated. The environment, nevertheless, however carefully estimated, is incapable of explaining Julian. It is in himself in his intellectual beginnings in the secret of his moral character, in the psychology of his history, that one must of course look for the motives of his Satanic endeavor

to resuscitate the dying paganism of his day. Fortunately the materials for mental analysis are ready of access. His writings are full of memories and soul confidences. As with many others whose lives, however active, never completely rid themselves of their dreams. Julian rarely forgets himself. M. Allard has thus been able to draw from his extant works materials for a very complete picture of the mind and heart life of the Apostate and he has wrought them into a tableau of great freshness and beauty. The most honorable and the most successful period of Julian's life was the five or six years spent at the head of the Roman legion in Gaul. Here he drove back the northern barbarian and for the time delayed the invasion that threatened the Empire. The author has given considerable space to these Gallic campaigns, finding it some satisfaction, as he says, to dwell for a while in praise of a man in whom there is so much that calls for condemnation. The first half of the second volume is taken up with the military and political life of Julian as Emperor, and with his specific efforts to reëstablish the pagan cult under the elaborate form or reform into which he endeavored to shape it. A highly interesting section of this part is the account of Julian's own extravagantly superstitious practices, his Sun worship, his stoical asceticism and the like. The latter portion of the volume brings out in some detail the legislative persecution of the Christians, which unlike that of the earlier Cæsars was not bloody or violent in its methods, but subtly civil, striking at the social and educational rights of those who professed Christianity.

The third volume deals with the Anti-Christian efforts of the Apostate in the East, with his polemical writings in the same direction, with his efforts to rebuild the Jewish temple, and with his campaign against the Persians, in which he lost his life. Two portions of this volume have a singular interest and importance: the summary, in which the formative principles and environing circumstances that produced the widely abnormal character of Julian are brought under a comprehensive and highly illuminative survey, and the appendices, in which the sources, pagan and Christian whence his history is derived, are subjected to a critical analysis. For the rest, we can give no fairer estimate of the work as a whole than to say that it reflects throughout the true historical spirit in which it was conceived. The author designed it to be *une oeuvre purement historique*, not *un livre de polemique*. The time has long gone by in which attacks were made on politics by writing books of Roman history. True learning indulges no such phantasies. It seeks solely to throw light upon the past, content when it can to trace the exact sequence of events and portray the true lineaments of a character. The life of Julian contains great and opportune lessons;

their efficacy depends on their being faithfully recounted. It is the highest claim to commendation that M. Allard's work has realized this ideal of the function of history.

"LES SAINTS:" ST. ALPHONSE DE LIGOURI. Par *Le Baron J. Angot des Rotours*. Pp. xvii., 183.

UN PAPE FRANÇAIS: URBAIN II. Par *Lucien Paulot*, de l'Oratoire de S. Philippe de Nerl. Pp. xxxvi., 563. Paris: Victor Lecoffre, 90 Rue Bonaparte. 1903.

It is a noteworthy phenomenon that just at this time when the heads of the French government, stimulated by the Satanic machinations of the Lodges, are putting forth their subtlest and strongest efforts to tear out the very roots of Christianity in France, some of the ablest apologetic and expository works on Christian truth ever produced are emanating from the Catholic press in that country. To say nothing of the three great Catholic encyclopædias now under way—the *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, the *Dictionnaire de l'Archeologie Chrétienne* and the *Dictionnaire de Theologie*, each of which is a repertoire of solid learning and deep religiousness of which the scholars and the Church in any land might well be proud—such monuments to the history of early Christianity as are being reared by M. Paul Allard, such a tribute to the mediæval Papacy as has just now been put forth by M. Paulot, such a contribution to sound hagiography as is comprised in the current series *Les Saints*—these, to mention but a few of the more recent, are works that tell more eloquently than words that there must be strong faith and zeal in the mind and heart of a people that desires such food and that can manifest such products of its efficacy. The more so since these works are not polemical nor professedly apologetical; they are not called forth in protest or defense against the persecutor. They are simply expositions of Catholic history, Catholic biography and Catholic heroism. Nor is it without special significance that many of the volumes in the series *Les Saints* are, as is the case with the latest addition thereto—the present volume on St. Alphonsus—the work of laymen. And no less deserving of notice is it that it is precisely those contributions to the series that have been produced by laymen that are in special demand. Thus, for instance, the volumes by M. Henri Joly—who, by the way, is the editor of the series—i. e., those on *Sts. Teresa*, and *Ignatius Loyola*, and that type of subtle spiritual insight, *La Psychologie des Saints* are now in their fourth, fifth and eighth editions respectively. The volume by M. G. Kurth on *St. Clotilde* has reached the seventh edition, that by M. Ad. Hatzfeld, the sixth edition, that by the Prince de Broglie on *St. Vincent de Paul*, the

eighth edition, and so on with others. It is not necessary to direct the readers attention to the interpretation of these phenomena. Of the present volume on *St. Alphonsus*, by the Baron Angot des Roteurs, we deem it no slight praise to say that it deserves its place in the series of which it forms a part. Like its companion volumes it is scholarly without being dry, edifying without exaggeration. It reflects a true sense of proportion. The history of the Saint's exterior activity does not obscure the portrayal of his inner life; nor the details of his asceticism overcrowd the narrative of his deeds of charity and his doctrinal productions. As all the volumes of *Les Saints* are appearing in English, let us hope that this one will find a more competent translator than has fallen to the lot of some of its predecessors.

M. Goyan in his brilliant preface to Père Paulot's biography of Urban II. quotes Hello to the effect that whenever the Occident and the Orient come into contact something mighty begins, and he compares the meeting of the West by the East at the birth of Christianity with that of the East by the West in the days of the mediæval Urban. At the opening of the Christian era the religious idea, he says, widened out the horizon of men; but at that era the political circumstances were favorable; for each time that the frontiers of the Empire receded the human perspectives grew larger. Urban II. took up the work of enlargement, but at the close of the eleventh century the political conditions were hostile. A thousand years before, by some providential design whose mystery St. Augustine's spiritual insight has penetrated, Roman Unity had seconded the Christian ideal of a universal brotherhood. In 1095 feudal dismemberment thwarted and paralyzed that ideal. A thousand years before events wrought for the idea; in 1095 events wrought against it. And yet, thanks to the energy and prestige of Urban, the idea came forth victorious; it siezed upon the conditions, mastered and shaped them. The "City of God" had been relegated to the domain of abstractions. Urban brought it down to earth; transplanted it and thus gave it a reality. In arming itself it grew to the consciousness of its existence and of its rights. Shortly before divided against itself, first by the conflict between Emperor and Pope and then by the crumbling of the fiefs and the quarrels between the cities, it presently became one at the call and under the discipline of the Pope. Lord with lord, village with village, shoulder to shoulder, heart to heart, all moved onwards for God, for Christ, for Christendom. In those ages when the armor seemed at times to make the man, signed with the cross the armor was soon seen to make the Christian. Whatever in the tastes and the customs of men separated them from Christ, thenceforward under the auspices

of the cross brought them nearer to Christ. The voice of a Pope made them companions in arms to teach them to regard one another as brethren and the comradeship of the camp ratified and revealed to them this baptismal fraternity. It is of this unifying man, of the Pontiff who brought the *disjecta membra* of the mediæval social organism under the dominance of a single soul-thought, who gave to the Europe of his day the impulse to the Crusades and thus saved Western civilization from the thraldom of Islamic barbarism, of Urban the worthy successor of Gregory that Père Paulot has written the life and labors in the volume whose title is given above. The work is no panegyric and no polemic. The story of the saintly Pontiff needs but an unvarnished recital to tell what manner of man was Odon and what the world owes to his heroic labors. What these labors were, how manifold and how severe a mere glance at the chronological table (prefixed to the volume), which presents an outline of his work from his entrance as a novice at Cluny in 1076 (he was born in 1042) to his death in the twelfth year of his Pontificate at Rome in 1099. What labors were crowded into that scarcely more than a score of years and particularly into the concluding eleven challenges belief. Père Paulot has given us the record of it all with references to authoritative sources that assure its fidelity to fact, with sympathy for the subject that makes its way to the reader's soul, and with a felicity of expression that sustains one's interest throughout. The work is a solid contribution to the literature of mediæval history, political as well as ecclesiastical.

THE MAKING OF OUR MIDDLE SCHOOLS. An account of the Development of Secondary Education in the United States. 8vo., pp. 541. By *Elmer Ellsworth Brown, Ph. D.*, of the University of California. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

The educational question is always a burning question. This is true in a special sense in this country where public school education plays such an important part in the training of our boys and girls. Although the system has been in existence a long time, it is far from perfect, and is constantly changing and developing. Hence every contribution to the history of the subject is interesting and valuable. The volume before us is not an exception. The status of our elementary schools is pretty clearly defined. That of the secondary school is far from being settled.

The scope and character of secondary education, roughly defined as "education of a higher stage than that of the elementary school and lower than that of institutions authorized to give academic degrees," occasion much discussion.

For this reason Dr. Brown's contribution to the literature of the subject will be of deep interest to all educators. Among the topics treated are :

"The Grammar Schools of Old England."

"Early Colonial Grammar Schools."

"The English Academies."

"Early State Systems of Secondary Education."

"The Movement Towards Public Control."

"Notes on School Life and Studies."

It can be seen at a glance that these headings cover the field comprehensively; it is impossible in a book of this size to exhaust the subject. It is all interesting, particularly to a pedagogical student, but the readers of the *Quarterly* will be most interested in Chapter XV., entitled "Special Movements," which treats of the efforts of the Catholic Church in secondary education. Special mention is made of Archbishop Carroll, Archbishop Hughes, the Jesuits, the Sisters of Charity (Mother Seton's), Sisters of Notre Dame of Namur, Sisters of the Sacred Heart, Christian Brothers, etc.

The dispassionate record of Catholic educational endeavors is gratifying and quite in contrast with that which characterizes some of the so-called Histories of Education on the same subject.

A brief history of Girard College, Philadelphia, is given on page 541. As bearing on this point it may be stated as an unquestionable historical fact that "Stephen Girard had no intention to found an infidel institution. He intended that his money would go to build a college for the education of the boys of the city, without distinction of creed, and he believed that unless some great protection was placed around the children the institution would in a short time become a huge proselytizing concern."—*Philadelphia Times*, May 27, 1897.

We mention this not because Dr. Brown has made the opposite statement, but because the conclusion has so often been wrongly drawn from the historical premises.

The author shows that he has studied the subject of secondary education well when he says:

"There are many reasons why the question of teachers is more important than the question of studies. And the conviction is now well grounded that teachers of secondary schools as well as teachers of primary schools must be specially trained for their work." (P. 443.)

It is a patent truth, and yet it is often overlooked. The question of the relative importance of the teachers of various grades has often been discussed. The importance of each one over the others has been claimed at different times. The truth is they are all equally

important. It is always a question of the development of a human being, and at every moment that work is sublime and should be effective in time and in eternity.

Chapter XX., "The Outlook," is the concluding chapter and one of the most readable in the book. Evidently Dr. Brown has little sympathy with the doctrine that the State should arrogate to itself the sole work of education. This opinion is quite commonly held by admirers of the common school system, and many of them go so far as to accuse those who don't agree with them of being disloyal to the State. Thinking persons are beginning to see that the public school system is not ideal. The following quotations are indications of the trend of thought on this subject:

"There are many signs of growing interest in religious education. The Roman Catholic Church, after many years of effort in the building up of primary schools on the one hand, and colleges and universities on the other, is now turning its attention to the establishment of high schools. It is not unlikely that a marked increase in such schools may be seen in the near future. Other religious denominations, too, are showing much concern for the establishment of schools for education of a secondary character." (P. 451.)

"A governmental monopoly is not desirable in any stage of our educational system; perhaps least of all at the secondary stage."

"The public schools must be non-sectarian for generations to come—probably as long as religious denominations exist. And we make no mistake when we regard such schools as constituting one of the crowning glories of our national life, and a strong support of much that is best in our American civilization. *But private and denominational schools should be welcomed too, and recognized as having a work of their own to do*—as supplementing the noble scheme of education under public management, which has been found so well suited to the general needs of our people."

"We may hope, too, that fraternal relations between teachers of public and private schools will be more generally cultivated in the future than they have been in the past. Each of these great bodies of teachers needs the help of the other to stir it up in the way of making instruction more thoroughly educational, which means more true to life." (P. 453.)

DIE MESSE IM DEUTSCHEN MITTELALTER. Beiträge zur Geschichte des religiösen Volkslebens. Von Adolph Frans. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. 1902. Price, \$4.15.

In this valuable contribution to liturgical literature, the learned author treats of the place which the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass held

in the life of the people during the Middle Ages, especially in Germany. It is a work of amazing erudition and leaves no phase of the subject unstudied. As the Holy Mass was the chief battleground in the conflict of the Church with heresy in the sixteenth century, it is important to be thoroughly acquainted with the views and opinions which had grown up around it in the course of ages, views and opinions some of which are strange to modern minds. Hence the author has devoted great pains to the study of local customs and traditions relating to the Mass and is by no means reticent in noting any abuse or exaggeration which he has anywhere discovered. If we may be permitted a word, we are disposed to suspect that he is sometimes a little too finical in denouncing the "superstitions" of the vulgar. The uneducated people have a way of expressing their sentiments in all matters that affect them deeply, which grates upon the esthetic sense of the over-refined. It has been quite fashionable, since the days of Erasmus, to make merry over the child-like demonstrations of faith of the Catholic populace. But we are far from convinced that the Erasmian philosophy is more acceptable to God than the naïve worship of His ruder children. It may have been superstitious, for all we know (so elastic is the term), in the afflicted woman of the gospels to think that she could be healed by touching the hem of Christ's garment. Yet, healed she was. And if we shrink from calling said woman superstitious, wherefore shall we decry as superstitious the firm belief of Catholics, not only in the Middle Ages but in every age, that a virtue goes forth from the Holy Sacrifice and from everything pertaining to it, altars, chalices, corporals, altar-linens, etc., for the healing of all spiritual and corporal ills? Now more than ever it is necessary to be careful not to suffer ourselves to be influenced by Protestant views in the matter of Catholic customs and ceremonies. Everything in the Church of Christ is sacramental. She herself is the greatest of Sacraments, and sanctifies everything she comes in contact with. Instead of discouraging, we should encourage and guide the devout reverence of the people for things sacred. It is always amusing to notice the solicitude of literary people lest the populace "overdo" things. They rarely give the rude and uneducated credit for much common-sense or keen Catholic instinct. And yet, experience teaches us that these qualities are much oftener found among the lower classes than the higher, especially in matters of religion. It was probably a condescension to Protestant sentiment that induced the author, on page 71, to deplore the effect upon the uneducated of the enthusiastic terms in which mediæval preachers extolled the efficacy of the Mass. "Such language," he tells us, "*might easily* lead astray the laity and the less educated among the clergy, and beget opinions false and injurious

to sound ethical principles. *Of course*, the acquisition of the benefits of the Mass is always made dependent upon the piety of the faithful and also upon their spiritual condition: *but* these qualifications are thrown in the shade by the assurances of the *certainly* of the operations of the Mass. The people, therefore, *might easily* be deluded into the belief that the bare act of hearing the Mass would inevitably issue in their obtaining all its promised and wished-for fruits." The author gives no other warrant for this strange bit of philosophizing, than a snatch from a ribald Lutheran "poem" called *Regnum Papisticum*, where it properly belongs. We can, at all times, safely trust the sagacity of the rudest of the Catholic population to draw a wide distinction between that perfect confidence in the efficacy of divine institutions, which the gospels term faith, and the blind attachment to outward ordinances with which our good people are so flippantly charged by Protestants and by certain of our literary people.

In thus putting in a modest plea for the devotions of the common people, we do not wish to be understood to bear too heavily on the learned book before us. Franz's mistake is one common to his class, and detracts but little from the general excellence of the work. The discriminating reader will find in it much useful information, and will conceive a higher esteem for the deep religiousness of Catholics in pre-Reformation times.

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS, 1493-1803. Explorations by Early Navigators, Descriptions of the Islands and their Peoples, their History and Records of the Catholic Missions, as related by contemporaneous Books and Manuscripts, showing the Political, Economic, Commercial and Religious Conditions of those Islands from their earliest relations with European Nations to the beginning of the Nineteenth Century. Translated from the Originals. Edited and Annotated by Emma Helen Blair and James Alexander Robertson, with Historical Introduction and additional notes by Edward Gaylord Bourne, with maps, portraits and other illustrations. 55 vols., large 8vo., cloth, uncut, gilt top. Price, \$4.00 net per volume. Vol. I., 1493-1529, pp. 357. The Arthur H. Clark Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

If there be one question which more than any other is engaging the attention of the world at the present time it is the Philippine question. This assertion may seem exaggerated at first, but it will bear examination. A few years ago the Philippine Islands were comparatively unknown. They were so completely under the control of Spain, and their contact with the outer world was so very limited except through Spain, that they seldom attracted the attention of other nations. The isolated geographical situation of the islands, and the marked distinctive character of the inhabitants, did not serve to draw them away from home, nor to draw others to them.

Now all this is changed. The entrance of the great United States into possession of the Islands brings them before the world. Up to that time very little was known about them, and very few persons thought of enquiring about them. Now every one is interested and seeking information. As is the case with all new and difficult questions, an enormous amount of ignorance has been masquerading and misleading the public until the most contradictory statements were made and believed, and fair-minded persons almost despaired of ever learning the truth. This condition extended even to government circles, and those who should have understood the Philippine question best in order to be able to act wisely and justly, found themselves drawn in different directions by the contradictory reports of the very persons who were supposed to be well informed, and who, in some instances, had been appointed and equipped to search out the truth. As a result there have been many heart-burnings and many humiliating changes of front.

It is not our purpose to discuss the reasons for all this confusion, and there were many, but to call attention to the condition in order to emphasize the necessity for a remedy. We suppose that this preliminary confusion was inevitable, but it was none the less inexcusable. When we consider the full mass of historical data on the Philippines which was accessible, it is hard to find an excuse for those who neglected to use it. It will not do to say that most of it was far away, and in foreign languages. The importance of the subject demanded every sacrifice.

But now at last we have the truth brought to our very doors. In the magnificent work which the Arthur H. Clark Company, of Cleveland, is bringing from the press the Philippine Islands are being exhaustively treated.

It is not the purpose of the publishers to make out a case for any one. They are gathering together in the most skilful manner and in the most attractive form the full history of the Philippine Islands from 1493 to 1803. They are going to all parts of the world where the data for this history can be found; they are calling to their assistance learned men of every profession and various countries; they have chosen able editors; and they are sparing no pains and no expense to perfect the work.

The result will be monumental. These fifty-five large octavo volumes of at least 425 pages each will probably never be superseded by any other work on the Philippines, and never equaled by a work on any other country of the same size, for there are few countries so rich in historical documents.

The first volume has just appeared and is fully up to the high expectations which the previous announcement begot in the minds

of the reading public. It is also a guarantee of what is to come. Those who are thinking of purchasing the book should remember that only one thousand sets will be printed, and that the widespread interest in the subject is so great as to make the demand prompt and exhaustive.

JOSEPH KARDINAL HERGENRÖTHER'S HANDBUCH DER ALLGEMEINEN KIRCHENGESCHICHTE. Fourth edition, revised by *Dr. J. B. Kirsch*, Professor in the University of Freiburg. Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis. Vol. I. The Church in the Ancient World. Price, \$3.60.

We scarcely recognize the dear old form of the late Cardinal in the new dress which has been imposed upon him. We presume it is all right to make him change with the fashions; but it is not easy to reconcile oneself with the way they have in Germany of tampering with the texts of great author. In English countries an author's text is sacred. Whenever it is necessary to bring it up to date, this is done by means of annotations, which are carefully distinguished from the words of the original. Witness Bury's admirable new edition of Gibbon, which is model in every way. In Germany they are not so squeamish. If Pastor sets at work to bring out a new edition of Janssen, he has no hesitation in altering the text to suit his own notions of propriety. When Pastor passes away, some younger professor will treat his works in the same way. In consequence, it is next to impossible, without having at hand the original, as well as the later editions, to know for certain just what the author himself thought or wrote. This has its disadvantages at times. For it is not at all certain that the original author would acquiesce in many of the changes which his editors consider to be improvements. At any rate it is always necessary, in quoting German works that run through many editions, to use the hyphenated form of Janssen-Pastor, or Hergenröther-Kirsch, or some other similar combination, in which the personality of the original writer becomes almost evanescent. In no instance has such scant courtesy been shown to a distinguished author as in this fourth edition of Hergenröther's valuable history of the Church. We do not say that Dr. Kirsch has not made improvements of various kinds by his summary method of "neu-bearbeitung" the text of his master; but the result reminds one of a sonata by an old master worked over by Liszt, in which only an expert can tell how much is old and how much is new. Well, no doubt, the Cardinal from his throne above will reecho the sentiment of St. Paul: "So that every way Christ be preached, in this also I rejoice." Perish the individual, so that theological science be kept up to the level of *actualité*! Those of us who for twenty years have

been masticating the text of the old edition may continue to do so; the younger generation will begin on Kirsch, to see him eventually give way to some one still more advanced. Thus may "we rise on stepping-stones," etc. In the Catholic Church it is not the individual, but his work, which counts.

We trust that Dr. Kirsch and the other learned professors of Germany will not look on us as Philistines. They will be the first to acknowledge that there is a dignity and an authority attaching to the words chosen by a Hergenröther, a Hefélé, or a Janssen for the expression of their great thoughts which carry much weight and merit to be preserved. Such men are not given to the Church every day; and their disciples who have grown to greatness under their able direction ought to consider it a most sacred duty not to destroy their "epea pteroënta." Who, in fact, will be disposed to submit to the drudgery of authorship, if he foresees that within one short generation his work will be "neu bearbeitet" beyond recognition?

But these are merely the grumblings of an antiquated "laudator temporis acti." If it be definitely settled that the works of our departed great ones are simply dough in the hands of succeeding editors, to be worked over and over again, let us at least hope that this delicate task will always be entrusted to hands as skillful as those of the learned Freiburg professor.

The new edition is much more presentable and convenient than the old, which was extremely unwieldy. As there is no particular reason why the work should be reissued in three huge volumes, why not divide into four or even five?

TRACES OF THE ELDER FAITHS OF IRELAND. A Folklore Sketch. A Handbook of Irish Pre-Christian Traditions. By W. G. Wood-Martin, M. R. I. A., author of "Pagan Ireland," "The Lake Dwellings of Ireland," etc. With numerous illustrations. In two volumes. 8vo., pp. xx.-405 and xvi.-437. New York: Longmans, Green & Co.

Some idea of the extent of the work which the author mapped out for himself in this book may be formed from the opening words of the Preface which he calls Foreword:

"A sarcastic writer lately advised authors treating on Irish subjects not to omit commencing their essays from the starting point of the Biblical Deluge, so that no fact, direct or collateral, in the matter under consideration might escape notice. Critics do not, as a rule, confine themselves between too narrow limits, but the above recommendation, though good in its way, does not give a wide enough field to work on, at least when Ancient Erin itself is in question. The liberty, therefore, is taken of ignoring the well-meant advice, of

exceeding the prescribed limit, and the subject is opened somewhere in the early Glacial, or perhaps in the Tertiary period. The writer has, in fact, placed himself in the unenviable position of the advocate who, opening his speech with the sentence, 'Before the birth of the world,' was cut short by the judge, who exclaimed: 'Do you not think that we might pass on to the Deluge?' "

The book is almost bewildering in the abundant material collected within the two volumes. Some idea of the wide research which the author brought to the work may be formed from a glance at the bibliography at the end of the second volume which shows nine hundred and eight sources of information. The result is a wonderful collection of legends and stories, traditions and superstitions, running through the centuries with all the variations which time works in such fields. The curious reader may find here the origin of many strange customs and beliefs which have persevered to the present day.

In a work of this kind it is hard to preserve exact order, and the author tells us that his object was to get the many sides of a great subject before the general reading public, with the hope that some great writer will do for Irish archæology what a Prescott and a Motley have done for history at large.

Many readers of the book, while they admire the indefatigable zeal of the author in gathering his materials together, will not agree with him in his deductions. Here is the keynote to a line of reasoning running all through the work:

"Christianity is generally supposed to have annihilated heathenism in Ireland. In reality it merely smoothed over and swallowed its victim, and the contour of its prey, as in the case of the boa-constrictor, can be distinctly traced under the glistening colors of its beautiful skin. Paganism still exists, it is merely inside instead of outside."

AN APOLOGY FOR THE RELIGIOUS ORDERS. By *Saint Thomas Aquinas*. Edited with an Introduction by the *Very Rev. Father John Procter, S. T. M.*, ex-Provincial of the English Dominicans. St. Louis, Mo. Herder, 17 South Broadway. Price, \$1.60.

Under this general caption Father Procter has given us an English rendition of two controversial pamphlets, or *Opuscula*, of St. Thomas on the subject of the religious life. The value of the little book of 486 pages is not at all to be measured by its size. It presents the Angelic Doctor at his best. Indeed it may be doubted whether it may not be called the very best and ripest production of his mighty pen. As is generally known, William of St. Amour, so called from

his ancestral estate in Burgundy, was the literary leader of the faction of secular priests at the University of Paris who bitterly resented the occupation of theological chairs by members of the newly founded Mendicant Orders, and the prestige given to these Orders by such teachers as Albertus Magnus, St. Thomas and St. Bonaventura, with whom the secular teachers were utterly unable to compete. From a squabble over the statutes of the University, the transition was easy to a full-fledged controversy regarding the very constitution of the Mendicant Orders. William's pamphlet *De periculis novissimorum temporum*, in which the Mendicants are berated as "forerunners of antichrist" and as subverters of all ecclesiastical discipline, and the Bishops are exhorted to take stringent measures to defend their episcopal jurisdiction against the extensive privileges and immunities granted to the Friars by the Holy See, is a masterpiece of vituperative rhetoric, worthy of Luther in his palmiest days. But its chief value is that of having induced St. Thomas to indite these two *opuscula*, which will remain, to the end of time, the ablest vindication of the great monastic institution of which he was the most brilliant ornament as well as the staunchest champion. It is characteristic of the Angelic Doctor that, whilst his language is direct and forcible, he is as cool under fire as if he were quietly contemplating the eternal truths in the retirement of his cell. In this respect he is the pride and model of Catholic polemics through all ages. As the question at issue is of perennial interest, we should be pleased to see a copy of this little book in the hands of each of our educated laity.

HERDER'S KONVERSATIONS-LEXICON. Dritte Auflage. Vol. 1. A bis Bonaparte. B. Herder: St. Louis. Net price, \$3.50.

We have received, through the courtesy of Mr. Herder, the first volume of the third edition of his magnificent *Konversations-Lexicon*, a Catholic encyclopædia of universal information, forming a fitting complement to his invaluable *Kirchen-Lexicon*, the completion of which last year formed an epoch in the history of Catholic theological progress. Fortified with these two most important publications, we shall feel ourselves enabled to grapple with almost any subject, sacred or profane, which can be of interest to the Catholic scholar.

The existence of such works as these, which are made universally accessible to German Catholics, cannot but cause feelings of shame and envy in the breast of every English speaking child of Holy Church, when he turns to consider the total absence of anything similar in his own language. How often, when we have been asked

by studious Catholics for reliable reading matter on important subjects, have we been forced to return the melancholy answer, that "we know of no adequate or satisfactory work on the subject written in English." How long shall it continue thus? When Protestant houses issue publications in which our Faith receives scant courtesy, we content ourselves with complaints and protestations. In Germany the case is otherwise. There is little need there for any Catholic perusing a Protestant book; for the entire ground of religious belief, and every subject howsoever remotely pertaining thereto, has been thoroughly occupied by Catholic writers, whose labors command the respect of all. We recognize that the publication of a Lexicon like these of Herder is a herculean task; but it can be done; it is imperatively needed; and the attempt ought to be made. We hear many complaints about the literary apathy of our Catholic people; but one chief reason of their reading so little may be that they have really so little to read that appeals to their needs. With the foundation everywhere of free libraries, the buying of books by individuals is growing less every day. Now Catholic books of reference ought to be found in every public library; but they must first of all be written. *Exoriare aliquis!*

THE LIFE OF SAINT PHILIP NERI, Apostle of Rome and Founder of the Congregation of the Oratory. From the Italian of *Father Bacchi*, of the Roman Oratory. New and revised edition. Edited by *Frederick Ignatius Antrobus*, of the London Oratory. Two volumes in large octavo. B. Herder, 17 South Broadway, St. Louis, Mo. Price, \$3.75 net.

The name of St. Philip has been endeared to all English-speaking Catholics by the loving devotion of his two illustrious sons, Cardinal Newman and Father Faber, who had so deeply imbibed his spirit that in their persons the kindly Saint seemed once more to be walking the earth. The main events of his life have been known to us for many years through the masterly work of his great Italian son, Cardinal Capececiattolo, Archbishop of Capua. But admirable as is Capececiattolo's biography, there is still ample room for the original life of the Saint from which he drew his inspiration, the book in which all the great Oratorians were fond of studying the saintly character of their spiritual father. The naiveté with which Bacchi compiled his life of St. Philip, his old-fashioned method dwelling rather upon virtues and miracles and ecstasies, than upon outward incidents, presents the Saint from a different standpoint from that taken by the modern biographer. The impression produced by a perusal of Capececiattolo's work is that of the importance of St. Philip in the public life of the Church, his influence in the highest ecclesi-

astical circles, etc. This phase of the Saint's activity is only secondary with good old Father Bacci, who devotes just one-fourth of his space to the narrative of the Saint's history, the remaining three-fourths being expended upon his internal life. The latter method of describing a saint may not be as interesting as the former to the generality of readers, but it brings into a proper perspective the things which Saints deem to be by far the most vital and enduring. Let each of these great works remain side by side, in order that the lovely character of St. Philip may be ever better known and studied.

We congratulate Mr. Herder on the typographical beauty of the volumes. The half-tone illustrations are unusually good.

THE HARMONY OF THE RELIGIOUS LIFE. By *Herman J. Heuser*, Overbrook Seminary. 12mo., pp. 247, with frontispiece. New York: Benziger Brothers.

We read these Conferences as they appeared in *The Dolphin*, 1902, over the name Fra Arminio, and we have read them again in book form, with increased pleasure, and we hope with increased profit. They are charming, using that work in its true and best sense. We cannot improve on the following description written by an appreciative and discerning pen:

"This book presents a new departure in the literature of spiritual treatises, being, as it were, a popular manual of religious perfection—a sort of 'Spiritual Life Made Easy,' its hardest lessons made winsome and acceptable.

"The work is a little gospel of cheerfulness, for religious primarily, written in an engaging literary style, under the form of an allegory. The author likens a religious institute to a grand organ, whose separate keys are the individual members of the community in which they live. The organist is Jesus Christ Himself, the Divine Director of the harmony of the religious life. If this harmony is to be perfect, the human elements of the spiritual instrument must be in accord with one another—attentive to the Master's directions and responsive to His behests. Following out the figure, the music of the Christian life is the glad, willing service of God and our neighbor required of every man and woman, whether in religion or not.

"The allegory is sustained throughout and admirably adapted to carry home convincingly the practical lessons of caution and counsel suggested by the author's sympathetic insight into the spirit of the real religious. The recesses of the mind and heart hold fewer secrets from Father Heuser than from many even of our most successful problem-novelists. His humor is of the sort that leaves a smile instead of a sting, and his pen is kind even when it is keenest in tracing shams and self-deceit."

A ROUND TABLE OF THE REPRESENTATIVE CATHOLIC GERMAN NOVELISTS.
With Portraits, Biographical Sketches and Bibliography. 12mo., pp. 235.
New York: Benziger Brothers.

Twelve stories by twelve representative German writers, six men and six women, done into excellent English, give us an entertaining volume of Catholic fiction. The stories are all good, not only from a literary point of view, but, which is more important, from a moral point of view also.

It is very refreshing and consoling to meet a book of this kind at a time when fiction has become so false, so inane, so immoral, as to be worse than useless. Parents should welcome books like this most heartily. They should place them in the family library, on the table, in the hands of their children. A fearful responsibility rests on those who have the direction of children and young persons in regard to their reading. It is a responsibility which cannot be avoided. Many persons have not time to read and decide in every instance on the merits of a book; others have not the ability; but all can safely trust publishers like Benziger Brothers, who publish only what has been read and approved by the proper officials of the Church. Their efforts to disseminate Catholic literature deserve all the encouragement that can be given to them. In the volume before us they not only give to English reading Catholics a collection of good stories, but they also produce a manual of German fictional literature, by giving us biographies and bibliographies and portraits of twelve German writers. May such work prosper.

MANUAL OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE, Comprising Dogma, Moral and Worship.
By a Seminary Professor. 12mo., pp. xiv., 587. Philadelphia: John J. McVey.

"This book is intended as a manual of religious instruction not only in the Novitiates and Scholasticates of teaching Congregations, but also in the classes of High Schools, Academies and Colleges. It is an abridgement of the three volumes of Dogmas, Moral, and Worship respectively, that constitute the Intermediate Course of Religious Instruction. In it will be found the whole substance of these volumes without any sacrifice of clearness, precision, or method. The teacher will find in the Intermediate Course, not only the matter for that explanation and development which should always accompany the use of a text for students, but also synoptic tables for the purposes of review. Yet this single volume is sufficiently complete to give the pupil that knowledge of religion, which in the words of St. Paul, is according to doctrine: that he may be able to exhort in sound doctrine, and to convince the gainsayers."

These words from the Preface of the book before us so clearly

state its nature and purpose, that nothing need be added. The larger work in three volumes has been received with words of the highest praise, and this summary is worthy of its predecessor. It is a complete catechism for high schools and academies.

TWENTY-FIVE PLAIN CATHOLIC SERMONS ON USEFUL SUBJECTS, with a Synopsis of Each Sermon. By *Father Clement Holland*. 12mo., pp. 422. Second Series. London: Thomas Baker.

The first series of Father Holland's sermons appeared about a year ago. The same plan is followed in the new series. Each sermon is preceded by a synopsis which is closely followed in the development of the discourse. This plan will help very much those who want to preach these sermons. We hope that the number is very small. It should be confined to two classes of persons: those who are unable to write their own sermons, and those who have not time to do so. We are not willing to admit that any priest is unable to write his sermons, and are very much tempted to deny that any priest has not time. We use the word write in the wide sense, meaning to prepare properly. This preparation should include prayer, meditation, reading, study, and composition, in full if possible, but at least in outline. Every priest can do this, and the failure to do it is a bad sign—if it exist. It indicates that we are not the educated, thoughtful, spiritual men that we are supposed to be, and we cannot admit that. We sincerely hope that preachers, and especially young preachers, will not be tempted by the multiplicity of sermon books that are pouring from the press, to neglect this vitally important duty of their ministry.

DE PERFECTIOE VITAE SPIRITUALIS, R. P. Antonii Le Gaudier, S. J. Editio recens emendata cura et studio P. A. M. Micheletti, S. J. Tom. I. Augustae Taurinorum (Turin), Typogr. P. Marietti. Londinum apud Thomas Baker, 1903. Pp. xiv., 604.

The first edition of Père Le Gaudier's treatise on the perfection of the spiritual life appeared in 1629. The reprint of that edition, published in 1855, having been exhausted, the curator of the present edition has brought out the work in a more attractive and convenient form. It is hardly necessary to say anything here in commendation of the work. Its place is in the front rank of treatises on ascetical theology. Père Le Gaudier was a master of the spiritual life; deeply versed in its theory he exemplified it in his life. Solidity, breadth, spiritual insight, unction and clarity of exposition are everywhere manifest in his writings. The present volume treats of the nature,

degrees and practice of perfection. A subsequent volume will embody the remaining three parts of the entire work—on the means, instruments and pursuit of perfection—together with two opuscula on the love and imitation of our Lord. Though primarily written for the spiritual training of the Jesuit, its principles, method and practices cover the universal science and art of the spiritual life, and every guide of the human soul will find in it abundant light and

Books Received.

- COMFORT FOR THE FAINT-HEARTED. By *Ludovicus Blosius, O. S. B.* Translated from the Latin by *Bertrand A. Wilberforce, O. P.* St. Louis: Herder. Price, 75 cents.
- THE RELIGIOUS STATE, THE EPISCOPATE AND PRIESTLY OFFICE. By *Saint Thomas Aquinas*. A translation of the Minor Work of the Saint on *The Perfection of the Spiritual Life*. Edited, with prefatory notice, by the *Very Rev. Father Procter, S. T. M.*, ex-Provincial of the English Dominicans. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. Price, \$1.00.
- REVEREND MOTHER M. XAVIER WARDE, Foundress of the Order of Mercy in the United States. The Story of her Life with brief sketches of her Foundations. By the *Sisters of Mercy*, Mount St. Mary's, Manchester, New Hampshire. Preface by Right Rev. Denis M. Bradley, D. D. Boston: Marlier & Company. Price, \$1.25.
- A DEVOUT COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS. Drawn chiefly from the works of St. Thomas Aquinas, of the Order of St. Dominic. By *Bertrand A. Wilberforce, O. P.* St. Louis: Herder. Price net, \$1.00.
- OXFORD AND CAMBRIDGE CONFERENCES. Second Series, 1900-1901. By *Joseph Rickaby, S. J.* St. Louis, Mo.: Herder. Price, \$1.35.
- THE TRUTH OF THE PAPAL CLAIMS. By *Raphael Merry del Val, D. D.*, Archbishop of Nicaea. A course of five lectures delivered in Rome in 1902 in reply to a book published by F. Nutcombe Oxenham, D. D., English Chaplain in Rome. St. Louis: Herder. Price net, \$1.00.
- FORTY-FIVE SERMONS, written to meet Objections of the Present Day. By *Rev. James McKernan*, of the Diocese of Trenton, N. J. 12mo., pp. 291. New York: Pustet & Co.
- BREVIARIUM ROMANUM. Romae-Tornaci. Typis Societ. S. Ioannis Ev. 48mo., 1903. Milwaukee: Wiltzius & Co.
- INSTITUTIONES JURIS ECCLESIASTICI. Quas in Usum Scholarum scripsit *Jos. Laurentius, S. J.* Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Price, net \$3.50.
- INSTRUCTIO PASTORALIS EYSTETTENSIS. Editio quinta. Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis. 620 pages. Price, \$2.85.
- TRACTATUS DE DEO-HOMINE, SIVE DE VERBO INCARNATO. Auctore *Laurentio Janssens, S. T. D.* Two volumes. I., Christologia. Price, \$3.60. II., Mariologia et Soteriologia. Price, \$4.25. Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis.
- HISTORIC HIGHWAYS OF AMERICA. The Exploration, Conquest and Development of America, based upon its Highways of War, Commerce and Immigration. By *Archer Butler Hulbert*. Vol. 3, Washington's Road (Nemacolin's Path). The First Chapter of the Old French War, pp. 215. Vol. 4, Braddock's Road and Three Relative Papers, pp. 213, with maps and illustrations. The Arthur H. Clark Co., Cleveland, Ohio.
- CASUS CONSCIENTIÆ ad usum confessoriorum compositi et soluti: ab *Augustino Lehmkuhl, S. J.* Vol. I. Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis. Price, \$2.40 net.

NOTICE.

Just as we go to press, we receive from Mr. B. Herder, St. Louis, the fifth and sixth volumes of the English translation of Janssen's *History of the German People*, of which an extensive review will appear in our July number.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the QUARTERLY will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the REVIEW not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutory, July, 1890.)

VOL. XXVIII.—JULY, 1903—No. 111.

DR. H. C. LEA ON THE CAUSES OF THE REFORMATION.

THE late Lord Acton,¹ Regius Professor of History in the University of Cambridge, whose unusual gifts and range of knowledge were recognized not only in his own country, but throughout Europe, had projected some time before his death an important work on modern history. The scheme was to be carried out by a number of scholars working in collaboration, and it was hoped that by this division of labor each period and movement might be dealt with by a man who was practically a specialist in the subject which was allotted to him. Unfortunately ill health compelled Lord Acton to resign the labors of editorship before much more had been done than to map out the sections into which the undertaking was to be divided. The work however was carried on by others, and now with commendable promptitude we have before us the first instalment of the twelve volumes, in which it is hoped that the political, religious, and social history of the last four centuries will eventually be set forth. I am not in any way proposing

¹ It may be of interest to some of my readers to mention that Lord Acton who was brought up a Catholic died in communion with the Church. Indeed for some years before his death at Cambridge, his figure was familiar at Sunday Mass. It is well known that at the time of the Vatican Council and afterwards his attitude gave much uneasiness to his Catholic friends. He was an intimate friend of Dr. Döllinger, and was commonly believed to be connected with the authorship of the letters to the *Kölnische Volkszeitung*, which appeared under the name of "Quirinus."

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1902, by P. J. Ryan, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

to review this volume of the *Cambridge Modern History* as a whole, but before passing further it will not be out of place to express my sense of the general excellence of the work that has been done. The majority of the contributors are men whose names are well known in the world of letters, and most of them are treating of subjects which they have made specially their own. It is remarkable to note how little the reader's taste is offended by glaring diversities of style, though the exclusion of all footnotes may perhaps account largely for this pervading sense of uniformity. At the same time the book is not heavy to read nor are the facts painfully compressed. What is specially attractive to the Catholic student is the moderate and judicial tone upon many thorny questions which is almost everywhere recognizable. No doubt the volume here and there contains statements which most of us would find a difficulty in accepting without qualification; but one feels in almost every case that the writer is expressing what he believes to be the truth, that he would be quite prepared to discuss the matter in a friendly spirit, and that he is not seizing the opportunity to ride to death some political or religious hobby with which he happens to be indoctrinated. No sensible Catholic could be angered, though he may possibly be pained, by Dr. Richard Garnett's very temperate chapter on "The Temporal Power." No Agnostic or Wesleyan, who is not a bigot, will, I am sure, refuse to commend the even-handed justice which Dr. William Barry metes out to friend and foe alike, in the section devoted to "Catholic Europe."

In this very harmonious concert of moderation and good sense, there is unfortunately one discordant note. The last chapter, a specially important chapter, has been entrusted to a writer whose whole tone of thought, as his published works abundantly prove, is in conflict with that temperate and judicial spirit which is elsewhere conspicuous. The author of the *History of Celibacy*, which, I need not remark, is a history of all that is very much the contrary, is by nature a special pleader. He loves to denounce and to overwhelm, to heap up example upon example, mixing up things that are important with things that are trivial, general laws with isolated exceptions, exaggerating every point that can be construed in his favor and slurring over all evidence that tells the other way. If reserves have sometimes to be made they are so introduced that a careless reader will take them to be only another count in the indictment, for the breathless tirade never seems to pause, and Dr. Lea has a way of narrating a fact completely destructive of his previous argument, with a grand air which seems to imply that it is quite the keystone of his logical arch. A more unsuitable contributor to write upon so delicate a topic as the causes which brought about the

great religious upheaval of the sixteenth century it would have been difficult to find, and I venture to say that this chapter on "The Eve of the Reformation"² is a serious blot upon a work for which one would otherwise have had nothing but praise. Appearing however as he does in such distinguished company Dr. Lea's utterances acquire an importance which would not attach to them if they were read within the covers of the *History of Celibacy* or his treatise on Superstition. For that reason I propose to select some passages for examination here, not indeed because I think that the refutation of this or that individual error will redress the balance, but rather with the view of showing how utterly unfit so untrustworthy a writer has proved himself for the delicate task allotted to him.

Let it not be supposed that I wish to underrate Dr. Lea's merits as a most industrious collector of facts—and fictions. Even more, I may readily admit that he has done a service to historical truth in calling attention to abuses which Catholic writers have been too prone to ignore. It is quite possible also that Dr. Lea if one met him in private life would show nothing of the violence, the contemptuous impatience of all judgments more lenient than his own which characterizes his utterances in print. But in his published writings he has long since proved himself a reckless partisan devoid of all sense of moderation and responsibility, and I venture to say that these defects are nowhere more conspicuous than in his recent contribution to the *Cambridge Modern History*. Let the reader judge from what follows whether this charge is made without sufficient ground. We will begin with a passage, for the length of which I apologize, but which would suffer if quoted in a mutilated form. After speaking of the papal pretensions in the matter of interdicts and excommunications, Dr. Lea goes on:

This was not the only manner in which the papacy interfered with secular justice, for, towards the end of the fifteenth century, the papal jurisdiction spread its aegis over the crimes of the laity as well as of the clergy. Since the early thirteenth century the papal Penitentiary had been accustomed to administer absolution, in the forum of conscience, to all applicants. In the fourteenth, this came to be a source of profit to the Curia by reason of the graduated scale of fees demanded and the imposition of so-called pecuniary penance by which the sinner purchased pardon of his sins. When the Castilian Inquisition began its operation in 1481, the New Christians, as the Jewish converts were called, hurried in crowds to Rome where they had

² Dr. Lea has apparently not made acquaintance, as he might very profitably have done, with the book of Abbot Gasquet, which also bears the title *The Eve of the Reformation*. If he had read this, he would presumably not have fallen into the vulgar error, which Abbot Gasquet has there so thoroughly exploded, of supposing that when men spoke of "the new learning" they meant the classical culture of the humanists. To the Englishman of the days of More and Erasmus, "the new learning" signified nothing more nor less than the heretical doctrines of the early reformers. This is only one trifling indication among many that Dr. Lea with all his parade of erudition is in reality very imperfectly acquainted with the literature of the period he is writing about.

no difficulty in obtaining from the Penitentiary absolution for whatever heretical crimes they might have committed; and they then claimed that this exempted them from subsequent inquisitorial prosecution. Even those who had been condemned were able to procure for a consideration letters setting aside the sentence and rehabilitating them. It was no part of the policy of Ferdinand and Isabel to allow impunity to be thus easily gained by the apostates or to forego the abundant confiscations flowing into the royal treasury, and therefore they refused to admit that such papal briefs were valid without the royal approval.

Even at the risk of a notable digression I cannot refrain from interrupting Dr. Lea in full career in order to draw attention to this characteristic example of his methods. The charges in this paragraph are all strung together in a series as if they were so many examples of the attempts made by the Papacy to interfere with the administration of justice and social order. And yet it would only need a touch of the brush to present, and more truthfully, this leniency of the Roman Penitentiaria as the protest of humanity and equity against the unexampled severities of the Spanish Inquisition.³ However for the moment Dr. Lea's sympathies are enlisted in the cause of national institutions, and it seems to him an intolerable interference with liberty that the Spanish Inquisitors should not have been allowed to skin their own Jews in the way that best pleased them. Strange to say also Dr. Lea is illustrating here how "the papacy interfered with *secular* justice" and "spread its aegis over the crimes of the laity as well as of the clergy." Now what were those "crimes" of the New Christians of which the Pope so arrogantly presumed to take cognizance? That a man was the son or grandson of a relapsed heretic who had been penanced by the Inquisition; that he had neglected to attend Mass; that he had used defamatory words of ecclesiastics or of the mysteries of the holy faith. If these things did not belong to the jurisdiction of the Vicar of Christ, the supreme judge in spiritual causes, as all Christians then allowed, what matters, we should like to ask, did legitimately fall within his province? But let us allow Dr. Lea to finish his indictment:

Sistus on his part, (he goes on), was not content to lose the lucrative business arising from Spanish intolerance, and in 1484 by the constitution *Quoniam nonnulli* he refuted the assertion that his briefs were valid only in the *forum conscientiae* and not in the *forum contentiosum* and ordered them to

³ This is in fact the view of Mr. H. Butler Clarke who writes of Spain *ex professo* in the same volume. He says for instance (p. 359): "Under the presidency of Torquemada (1482-1494) the Inquisition distinguished itself by the startling severity of its cruel and humiliating *autos* and reconciliations. Sixtus IV. made several attempts (1482-83) to check the deadly work, but was obliged by pressure from Spain to deny the right of appeal to himself. The Inquisitors were appointed by the crown which profited by their ruthless confiscations." And again (p. 356): "The Inquisition was an ecclesiastical instrument in the hands of the civil power, and when in 1497 the Pope abandoned the right of hearing appeals, this power became supreme."

be received as absolute authority in all courts, secular as well as ecclesiastical. This was asserting an appellate jurisdiction over all the criminal tribunals of Christendom, and, through the notorious venality of the Curia, where these letters of absolution could always be had for a price, it was a serious blow to the administration of justice everywhere. Not content with this, the power was delegated to the peripatetic vendors of indulgences, who thus carried impunity for crime to every man's door. The St. Peter's indulgences, sold by Tetzel and his colleagues, were of this character, and not only released the purchasers from all spiritual penalties but forbade all secular or criminal prosecution. These monstrous pretensions were reiterated by Paul III. in 1549 and by Julius III. in 1550. It was impossible for secular rulers tamely to submit to this sale of impunity for crime. In Spain the struggle against it continued with equal obstinacy on each side, and it was fortunate that the Reformation came to prevent the Holy See from rendering all justice, human and divine, a commodity to be sold in open market.⁴

Perhaps the first reflection which occurs to the mind after reading this terrific onslaught is that upon Dr. Lea's showing the early reformers must have played their cards very badly. Here was *indeed* a grievance. Something to rouse the just indignation of every temporal ruler in Christendom! And yet, strange to say, Luther and his followers are absolutely silent on this head! Can Dr. Lea really suppose that if such "monstrous pretensions" (I gladly endorse the phrase) were made by the popes, there would not have been protests by the thousand from every municipality, from every local magistrate, within whose jurisdiction the commissioners of indulgence had presented themselves? It would have been the burning question of the hour. When men were agitating and denouncing papal corruption in every quarter, is it not astounding that we hear so little of an intolerable abuse like this? Let us pass over for the present the question of the penitentiary fees which would claim an article to itself;⁵ and keep to the matter of interference with secular criminal justice. Our author refers to a certain definite constitution, *Quoniam nonnulli*, of Sixtus IV., which is to be found in the *Bullarium*, and to others which confirm it. Here at least we have an opportunity of putting his vague generalities to a practical test. Let us see what the constitution says.

The Bull *Quoniam nonnulli* is a perfectly straightforward document which is headed in the *Bullarium* quite accurately: "De auctoritate majoris Penitentiarii S. R. Ecclesiae." On the authority of the Grand Penitentiary of the Holy Roman Church, it has nothing strictly speaking to do with Spain in particular, but it complains

⁴ Pp. 661-662.

⁵ Dr. Lea has dealt with this matter at length in his book *A Formulary of the Papal Penitentiary* (1892) and in an article in the *English Historical Review* for 1893. I do not hesitate to say that both the one and the other are based upon a gross misapprehension of the simplest and most fundamental conceptions of the subject. Dr. Lea understands as little of Canon Law in general and the workings of the Penitentiary in particular as the average Frenchman does of the procedure of the English House of Commons; but his critics unfortunately know less than himself, and when he dogmatizes they accept him at his own valuation. I shall hope to make these assertions good in some future article.

that letters of the Apostolic Penitentiary have, under various pretexts, been rejected by certain *juris interpretes* as not possessing full papal authority. These canonists have falsely maintained that such letters were valid only in the *forum conscientiae* and not in *foro contentioso*, and also that though the Penitentiary might possess such authority himself, he could not delegate it to others. Under these circumstances the Pope decrees that such authority to absolve *may* be delegated, and he goes on to declare that the letters of the Penitentiary, when duly authenticated by certain forms, which he specifies, are to be received as of full authority in the tribunal of penance and in the courts both ecclesiastical and secular.⁶

Dr. Lea assumes because the secular court is mentioned that there was a deep-laid scheme to interfere with criminal justice. This is simply a gratuitous assumption. To prove it definite instances would be required, and even then not an isolated case or two but a series of instances. Of themselves the words have a perfectly intelligible signification. Let us take an example. A monk runs away from his monastery, casts off his habit and goes back to the world. He becomes thereby what was technically called an "apostate," which not only would have subjected him, if caught, to many kinds of penalties in the ecclesiastical tribunals, but would have debarred him from all legal rights if he were to appear as suitor in the secular courts. After a while he repents, and going to Rome, obtains absolution through the apostolic penitentiary both in the internal and the external forum. Now the Bull in question pronounces that this absolution, if in proper form, not only reconciles the offender with God in conscience, but is to be held valid in the ecclesiastical and secular courts as well. That is to say that the penitent monk or judaizing convert is not only formally reinstated in the eyes of the Church, but he is no longer to be subject to the civil disabilities entailed by his ecclesiastical offense. It would have been intolerable if the unfortunate man, though fully reconciled in

⁶ "Tam in foro judiciali et contentioso, Ecclesiastico et seculari, quam etiam in foro penitentiae omnimodam fidem faciant." *Bullarium*, i., p. 428. The Bulls of Paul III. and Julius III. confirming this refer to the matter thus: "Et nihilominus potiori pro cautela praemissa omnia et singula, prout per eundem Sixtum Praedecessorem declarata fuerant eisdem modo ac forma . . . decrevit (Papa) . . . Ranuntii et pro tempore existentis Majoris Penitentiarii praefati, juxta stylium praedictum expeditas litteras, quae clausae et confessoribus directae, in foro conscientiae tantum, quae vero apertae et sigillo praedicto, ut praefertur, pendenti, expeditae fuerant et in posterum expedirentur nisi in eis verba *in foro conscientiae tantum* apposita essent, in utroque, tam penitentiali quam judiciali et contentioso foro, intelligi et interpretari, ac illis quibus pro tempore concederentur suffragari." Julius III.'s Bull, *Rationi congruit* headed "De auctoritate et potestate summi penitentiarii." 1550. Cherubini, *Bullarium* (1727), i., p. 786.

both fora so far as the Church was concerned, was still to be treated by the secular courts as an outlaw. The case, after all, is very similar to that which arises in regard to the legal judgments pronounced in one country and pleaded in another country. I understand that by the constitution of the United States "it is declared that full faith and credit shall be given in each state of the Union to the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of every other state,"⁷ and speaking generally a similar rule of comity regarding foreign judgments obtains in the legal relations of different nations.⁸ Apart from some quite exceptional circumstances an Englishman who has been legally divorced from his wife in the state of Colorado and who marries again, will not be prosecuted for bigamy in England, even though the grounds upon which the divorce was obtained would not have sufficed for the purpose in the English courts. This does not imply that one country claims to exercise jurisdiction over the tribunals of another, but only that a judicial decision pronounced by one tribunal in matters within its competence is to be assumed, when it affects other tribunals, to have been equitably arrived at.

What Sixtus IV. demanded was simply the strictly logical outcome of the doctrine that the Pope in ecclesiastical matters was the "universal Ordinary." In such ecclesiastical causes he claimed that his writs should run throughout all Christendom. This at least was the mediæval theory, and it had long been the common teaching of jurists in every University of Europe.⁹ The briefs of the Penitentiary concerned ecclesiastical offenses only.¹⁰ If the brief were issued, as it sometimes was, in a form which implied absolution in the *forum externum*, then Sixtus claimed that the effect should be exactly the same as if the sentence had been delivered by the highest tribunal of the Court of Christianity. There is not a word in any of the bulls cited by Dr. Lea which would suggest that the Pope wished to interfere with the legitimate business of the secular and criminal tribunals. At the very utmost we may suppose—though even for this Dr. Lea cites neither facts nor authorities—that Sixtus may have had some idea of protecting the unfortunate victims of

⁷ Story, *Commentaries of the Conflict of Laws* (Ed. 1872), p. 754.

⁸ Phillimore, *International Law* (3d Ed.), vol. iv., p. 739.

⁹ See Professor Maitland's *Roman Canon Law in the Church of England* in the chapter on the "Universal Ordinary."

¹⁰ No doubt various offences appear in the tax tables which do not at first sight seem to have any ecclesiastical character, but either from the fact that the perpetrators were clerics, or because only absolution in the internal forum was sought, or because some sort of curse or excommunication was conceived to rest upon the perpetrators of the outrage, or for various other reasons, the ecclesiastical courts claimed jurisdiction. In a vast number of cases the penitentiaria being in doubt about the facts referred the applicant back to his Ordinary if he wished for absolution in *foro externo*.

the Spanish Inquisition from those wholesale confiscations in the civil courts which followed upon condemnation.

Moreover there is another serious difficulty. Hardly any modern writer is more strongly antipapal than Mr. Ulick Burke, whose *History of Spain* was published at the expense of Trinity College, Dublin, and is redolent of the intolerant atmosphere of that fortress of Protestantism. Still Mr. Burke writes of the years 1482-3:

This critical state of things was rendered all the more dangerous by the opposition against the Inquisition having extended to Rome itself. The Pope modified the Bull which he had given, deposed the most cruel among the Inquisitors, and ordered that an appeal to Rome should in all cases be permitted. Ferdinand responded by sending the Pope a minatory letter. The Pope was intimidated. On the 3d of August, 1483, he wrote that he intended to reconsider his last resolution in favor of the heretics, and until then he would leave the matter in suspense. Suspense under the circumstances was the equivalent of the victory of the Catholic Kings.¹¹

A similar statement, already quoted in a footnote, is also made by Mr. Butler Clarke in the *Cambridge Modern History* itself. According to Mr. Bergenroth, moreover, when papal remissions still continued to be obtained, Ferdinand "promulgated an ordinance stating that in the Kingdoms of Arragon and Valentia any person, whether ecclesiastical or secular, and without any distinction of class or sex, who should make use of a papal brief, should be put to death on the spot." And yet, if we are to believe Dr. Lea, the intimidated pontiff took this very opportunity to go far beyond the pretensions of his predecessors, and by his Bull *Quoniam nonnulli* in March, 1484, he is said to have laid claim to "an appellate jurisdiction over all the criminal tribunals of Christendom." Personally I am not satisfied that Sixtus IV. was intimidated to the extent that Mr. Burke, and Mr. Clarke and Mr. Bergenroth suppose, but one is surely justified in asking Dr. Lea to explain how he squares his theory with this, the accepted view,¹² and how the terror-stricken Pope only a few months later came to make claims of jurisdiction more extravagant than had ever been advanced before. If the Bull *Quoniam nonnulli* means what Dr. Lea says it means, it was an outrageous act of defiance hurled in the teeth of their Catholic Majesties and of all the sovereigns of Europe.

The fact is, as already said, that Dr. Lea ignores the secular disabilities and penalties incurred by so many of the misdemeanors for which the Roman Penitenciaría gave absolution. The *forum ecclesiasticum* and the *forum civile* were in many matters closely related

¹¹ Burke, *History of Spain*, Vol. II., p. 102. Though Mr. Burke uses no inverted commas it is rather amusing to find that this passage is taken word for word from Mr. Bergenroth's *Calendar of Spanish State Papers*, I., p. xlii.

¹² The same account is given by Benrath in the *Realencyclopädie für Protestantische Theologie*, 3d Ed., Vol. IX., p. 161. None of the authors referred to make the slightest allusion to the Bull *Quoniam nonnulli*.

and the status of a cleric who became "irregular" was affected in ways too numerous to dwell upon here. How deeply this idea had taken root in the legal conceptions of Europe and how long these views maintained their ground even after the Reformation had swept away the old Canon Law, is curiously illustrated by the case of Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury, who in 1621, when hunting at Bramshill in Hampshire, accidentally shot a gamekeeper with a cross-bow. Though the Archbishop was deeply distressed, and condemned himself to a monthly fast for the rest of his life, besides settling a handsome pension upon the man's widow, the tide of public opinion set strongly against him. It was declared that he had incurred "irregularity" and was incapable of discharging spiritual functions, so that as a matter of fact three bishops-elect refused to receive consecration at his hands. But, what is most germane to our present issue, it was publicly maintained by Williams, the Bishop elect of Lincoln, that "*by the common law Abbot had forfeited his estate,*" and it was thought fitting to grant him a formal pardon and dispensation, which was duly signed by King James I. If he had been an archbishop in the Roman Communion such an absolution would normally have been obtained through the Penitenciaría; and surely in such a case it would have been reasonable for the Pope to demand that his brief of absolution should be recognized not only in the ecclesiastical, but also in the civil courts. Why then should the simple mention of the "*foro contentioso ecclesiastico et saeculari,*" in Sixtus IV.'s Bull be construed into a deep laid plot to undermine the administration of criminal justice throughout Europe?

The perversity of Dr. Lea's interpretation of the constitution *Quoniam nonnulli* only becomes more apparent when we enquire into the arguments by which he defends it. The Cambridge History does not admit footnotes, but in the *History of Auricular Confession*, Vol. III., where Dr. Lea expounds the same views in almost identical words, it was to be expected that the author would furnish a few references—the more so that in matters which no one dreams of disputing he loves to overwhelm us with authorities. However if we turn to the volume in question, we find besides a reference to the text of the Bull, nothing but the following remarkable piece of evidence:

St. Antonino (*Summa*, P. III., Tit. xlv., cap. 17., sec. 3) is careful to explain that a Bull of absolution does not relieve the offender from judicial jurisdiction. Evidently the claim must have been already put forward in his time.¹³

¹³ Lea, *History of Confession*, III., p. 402, note 2. St. Antoninus only says (he is speaking of the effects of the Sacrament of Penance): "Ultimo nota quod Penitentia non instituit impunitatem in foro contentioso, imo habens bullam de absolutione ab homicidio nihilominus suspenderetur: nec liberat ab irregularitate." On Dr. Lea's principles it would follow from this that

Moreover he quotes a sentence from Hemmerlin's treatise of the Jubilee (1450), in which the writer explains that though a man go to Rome in the Jubilee, confess a crime and be enjoined a severe penance for it, this cannot interfere with the right of the secular judge to punish him for the same crime in the ordinary course of the law. Neither S. Antoninus nor Hemmerlin states or implies that there was any dispute about the matter, but because they chance to mention that the absolution of the Roman Penitenciaría does *not* release a criminal from the punishment of his misdeeds Dr. Lea is convinced that the authorities of the papal curia must have been of a different opinion. We see consequently that the sole evidence he adduces in support of his view, is that two mediæval casuists explicitly say the contrary. A curious line of argument this from a writer who poses as an expert in these out-of-the-way fields of legal knowledge. Dr. Lea has not seemingly attempted to investigate the opinion of the casuists any further. Yet surely the question is an important one, and if the Roman court seriously laid it down as a sound principle in law that a papal absolution secured every murderer or swindler from further proceedings, there must, one would think, have been a good deal written about it in the law books. However Dr. Lea is perfectly satisfied, and he considers it unnecessary to quote a single instance in which any one did try to plead the absolution of the *Penitenciaría* as a bar to criminal prosecution, neither does he produce any state paper of any kind complaining that the punishment of outrages against life or property was being interfered with by papal briefs. We all know that there were constant protests, well founded, or otherwise, about the inadequate punishment inflicted by the Church courts upon criminous clerks, why should this new abuse, which touches upon a matter of principle, have alone been passed over in silence?

But, it may be objected, when Dr. Lea goes on to speak of "the peripatetic vendors of indulgences who brought impunity for crime to every man's door" he is prepared to quote definite facts. I gladly welcome the facts, which are supplied by three absolutions granted by Tetzels, the only three of this class known to be extant. Two of them are cases of involuntary homicide, a little girl killed by a stone thrown at a dog, a boy accidentally struck by his father with a knife which was being used to kill a pig.¹⁴ In both cases the perpetrators

because St. Antoninus denies that Sacramental Confession saves a man from the legal consequences of his crime, therefore "the claim must have been put forward in his time," that a man had only to go to confession to snap his fingers at the hangman.

¹⁴ When one reflects upon the ignorance of the first principles of surgery common in the middle ages, especially in rural districts, it is easy to understand how even a slight wound might have led to a child's death.

are stated to have come deploring their mischance with tears. They paid a sum of money towards the rebuilding of St. Peter's, and obtained from Tetzel a form of absolution which in general terms forbade that they should be further molested for this cause. It may be difficult for us now-a-days to understand how a quite involuntary act can have required absolution, but the case of Abbot just referred to shows how deeply-rooted was the mediæval idea; and no one interested in the by-paths of history will be unacquainted with the curious judgments executed with all forms of law, even upon animals which were accounted guilty of taking human life.¹⁵

The third case is that of a priest and his church-warden held responsible for the disappearance of the Blessed Sacrament from a tabernacle in which the priest averred that he had safely locked it the evening before. It was the priest himself who discovered the loss and deemed it necessary to obtain absolution. In all these cases it is obvious that the persons implicated had not been arrested; but Dr. Lea is shocked because the absolution was given "on the bare assertion of the so-called penitent." How he knows this he does not tell us,¹⁶ but he assumes that every assassin, every forger or incendiary, had only to present himself to Tetzel, to declare that it was all a mistake, paying a handsome contribution to the building-fund of St. Peter's, and forthwith without further enquiry he would receive a papal brief securing him from all future criminal proceedings. What Dr. Lea forgets is that the men who thus applied to Tetzel, believing as they did in the censures of the Church and in a future life, held such absolution to be necessary. They knew perfectly well that a brief obtained by false representations was worthless both in the *forum externum* and *internum*. The very reason why the nature of the act was specified with all possible minuteness was precisely to prevent such briefs being used to screen real crimes. If Matthias Menner, who killed the little girl, had not been throwing a stone at a dog as he alleged to Tetzel, but had deliberately cut her throat, the papal absolution containing the description of how the stone was thrown would not have protected the delinquent. It would have been treated as null and void, because obtained by a fraudulent misrepresentation of the facts. Once again I ask: if Dr. Lea's views of Tetzel's indulgence briefs are exact, where are

¹⁵ Readers of "Lucas Malet's" powerful novel *Sir George Calmady* will remember the execution of the horse which causes its master's death and which indirectly supplies the principal tragic *motif* of the story. The instinct of vindictive punishment lies deep in human nature.

¹⁶ It does not follow that no enquiries were made because the penitent's own statement is alone mentioned. That the terms of that statement should be adhered to, was itself a protection against abuses. The text of Tetzel's brief is given in full in Loescher's *Monumenta*. Compare also the appendix of Dr. N. Paulus, *Johann Tetzel, der Ablass Prediger*.

the protests? Does he suppose that the municipalities of these busy German townships would tamely submit to see notorious murderers and thieves snatched from justice by a pardoner's paper absolution?

I have spent some time upon this point because the charge made seems so peculiarly atrocious. Dr. Lea comes forward as a self-constituted expert in the highly technical science of Canon Law, and unhesitatingly assures the world that the Popes of the close of the Middle Ages were engaged in a deliberate conspiracy to undermine secular justice and to sell immunity for the grossest crimes. "You may take my word for it," Dr. Lea virtually says to his awe-struck Protestant readers, "I have mastered the Roman penitential system, and you may find it all set down in the papal Bulls in black and white not only once but repeatedly. If a man committed a murder he had only to pay money to the Pope's delegate, and thereupon he received a brief which secured him from all unpleasant consequences for the rest of his life."

No one wishes to deny the reality of the grave abuses which were rampant at the close of the Middle Ages, but Dr. Lea is not content to paint in the very blackest colors those which did exist; he invents others that are purely fictitious. Moreover he embellishes even these with a reckless inaccuracy of detail which would be incredible in such a volume were it not that the papal side is always unpopular, and that papal law is a subject about which critics avowedly know little and care less.

But let us now turn to a new illustration of Dr. Lea's bias and of his carelessness even in the simple narration of facts. His principle seems to be that the first pebble which comes to hand is good enough to fling at a Renaissance pope. The chapter abounds in examples, but here is one that will serve my present purpose. Discussing on page 655 the pretensions of the papacy and the unscrupulous use to which they were put Dr. Lea writes:

Julius II. in his strife with France, gave the finishing blow to the little kingdom of Navarre by excommunicating in 1511 those "children of perdition" Jean d'Aibret and his wife Catherine, and empowering the first comer to seize their dominions—an act of piety for which the rapacious Ferdinand of Aragon had made all necessary preparations. In the bull of excommunication Julius formally asserted his plenary power granted by God over all nations and kingdoms.

Now it is interesting in the first place to compare this statement with what we find in another chapter of the same volume, that of Mr. Butler Clarke on the "Catholic Kings." This writer, as belonged to his allotted task, describes the events alluded to by Dr. Lea somewhat more in detail. He says:

Early in August (1512) Ferdinand renewed his promise to give up the kingdom of Navarre at the end of the war. His messenger was seized and imprisoned, and on the 21st of the month he published at Burgos the Bull *Pater (sic) ille celestis*, excommunicating all who resisted the holy

League and declaring their lands and honors forfeited to those who should seize them. Although Jean d'Albret and Catherine were not named, the Bull specially mentioned the Basques and Cantabrians, and dread of its threats brought about the surrender of the few places that still held out in upper Navarre. Ferdinand now threw off the mask and took the title of King of Navarre.

The difference of tone between the two contributors, especially if Dr. Lea's words are read in their context, is sufficiently apparent, but I would ask the reader to note in the first place the positive contradictions. Mr. Clarke says the bull was published in 1512; Dr. Lea in 1511. Mr. Clarke declares that Jean d'Albret and his consort were not named; Dr. Lea tells us that they were described as "those children of perdition" and formally dispossessed.

The question of date may seem trivial, but any one who knows the history of the controversy which has raged for three centuries over this famous bull will be aware that the time at which the bull was issued is a point of serious importance in the dispute. The year named by Dr. Lea, i. e., 1511, is upon every supposition certainly incorrect. But this is a minor matter as compared with the calm assumption that the bull *Exigit contumacia* which names Jean d'Albret and his queen and calls them "children of perdition" is an authentic document. For many hundred years, as above remarked, the genuineness of the bull has been fiercely contested and it was only upon the publication of M. Boissonnade's *Histoire de la Réunion de la Navarre à la Castille*¹⁷ (1893) that the question was practically cleared up. M. Boissonnade has ransacked the Spanish archives and has discovered nearly all the original papers. The fact is that there are two bulls. It is indeed quite true that a manifesto was issued by Pope Julius II. in 1512 (July 21st) against the partisans of the king of France, but this was the bull *Pastor ille coelestis*; which, as Mr. Clarke correctly states, does not excommunicate the King and Queen of Navarre *by name* and was a comparatively inoffensive document. So unsatisfactory was it from the point of view of the Spanish King Ferdinand, that he used all his efforts to commit the Holy See to something more decisive, and as a matter of fact there exists at Simancas another document *Exigit contumaciam* purporting to have been issued by Julius II. and dated February 18, 1513. This pronouncement, which is the only one to which Dr. Lea's description applies, is according to M. Boissonnade in all probability a forgery. M. Boissonnade gives his reasons in detail, and they seem most weighty. To begin with he tells us:

A la date ou elle est rédigée, c'est à dire. le 18 février 1513, les relations entre Ferdinand et Jules II. étaient singulièrement altérées et refroidies, comme l'attestent tous les historiens; de plus le pape agonisait,¹⁸ singulier moment pour réunir les cardinaux et pour promulguer une bulle.

¹⁷ P. 356 seq. The full text of both bulls is printed in the same volume, pp. 636-640 and 645-650.

¹⁸ Julius died in the night between Feb. 20 and Feb. 21, 1513.

Moreover, the terms of the bull seem to M. Boissonnade highly suspicious. Confirmatory evidence is wanting and the only original now in existence can be proved with absolute certainty not to be the actual document sent to King Ferdinand, a document which only reached him several weeks after the pope's death, and which was full of gross clerical errors.

But whether a signature was or was not wrung from the dying pontiff, it would have been well to call to mind something of the expedients by which the Pope was originally induced to throw himself into the arms of the League, and to notice the genuine provocation that had been given to him by France. These are the terms in which the matter is referred to even by so unfriendly a writer as Bergenroth in his preface to the *Calendar of Spanish State Papers*.¹⁹ Needless to say that of all such details Dr. Lea thinks it unnecessary to give his readers any inkling.

In order to make the Pope act according to his wishes he (Ferdinand) betrayed to him in secret the whole scheme of King Louis, whilst he ordered his ambassador in Rome to show more zeal than ever in public for the interests of France. It is easy to understand what effect these privy communications couched in the most vivid language, produced on the excitable and irascible pope. When he learnt that he was not only to be robbed of all his states, but also to be deposed and kept a prisoner in a dungeon, he went, in spite of his age, over the snow-covered mountains to fight his enemies in person.

In fine, the whole incident is singularly ill chosen to serve as a palmary example of the extravagance of the Papal pretensions. The facts are wrapped in uncertainty, even putting things at their worst, and there are excuses to be made for the Pope's action of which not the slightest hint is given. When a writer allows himself the luxury of such unmeasured terms of denunciation as we find in the paper of Dr. Lea, he ought to be very sure that the evidence he does adduce is sound as far as it goes. But the writer whom we are criticizing exhibits throughout a preference for all that is most startling and preposterous. Of judicious criticism, or verification there is literally not a trace.

Only a few lines above the example which we have been discussing Dr. Lea supplies us with what he considers another damning instance of the shameless audacity of the pretensions of the Holy See.

In his extraordinary letter to Mahommad II., then in the full flush of his conquests, Plus II. tempted the Turk to embrace Christianity with the promise to appoint him Emperor of Greece and the East, so that what he had won by force he might enjoy with justice.²⁰

This time we need not travel for our commentary outside the pages of the volume itself. In the excellent chapter on "the Otto-

¹⁹ Vol. II., p. 33. Introduction.

²⁰ Cambridge Modern History, I., p. 655.

man Conquest" contributed by Professor Bury, who is, by the way, Lord Acton's successor in the chair of History at Cambridge, we find the following sentences:

It was about this time (1460) that Pope Plus indited a most curious letter to Mahommad, proposing that the Sultan should embrace Christianity, and become under the patronage of the Roman see, "Emperor of the Greeks and of the East." A little thing, he wrote, only a drop of water, will make you the greatest of mortals; be baptized, and without money, arms, or fleet, you will win the greatest lordship in Christendom. Had this chimerical proposal been seriously meant, it would argue in Æneas an almost incredibly fanciful and unpractical mind; but when we find that he himself composed Mahommad's answer, we may infer that the letter was composed as a rhetorical exercise never intended to be sent.²¹

Let us turn now to a passage more directly connected with literary criticism than with the facts of history. It will be seen that Dr. Lea's jaundiced imagination colors all he reads. The famous satire called the *Ship of Fools*, by Sebastian Brant, is a work accessible to everybody. The old English translation of the sixteenth century has been elaborately edited in modern times and there are many versions both in Latin and French. Here is what Dr. Lea says of this book:

There was no product of humanistic literature, however, which so aided in paving the way for the Reformation as the *Narrenschiff*, or Ship of Fools, the work of a layman, Sebastian Brant, chancellor (city clerk) of Strassburg. Countless editions and numerous translations of this work, printed at Basel in 1494, showed how exactly it responded to the popular tendencies, and how wide and lasting was its influence. One of the foremost preachers of the day, Geller von Kalsersberg, used its several chapters or sections as texts for a series of sermons at Strassburg, in 1498, and the opinions of the poet lost none of their significance in the expositions of the preacher. The work forms a singularly instructive document for the intellectual and moral history of the period. Brant satirises all the follies and weaknesses of man; those of the clergy are of course included and, though no special attention is devoted to them, the manner in which they are handled shows how completely the priesthood had forfeited popular respect. But the important feature of the work is the deep moral earnestness which pervades its jest and satire; man is exhorted never to lose sight of his salvation and the future life is represented as the goal to which his efforts are to be directed. With all this, the Church is never referred to as the means through which the pardon of sin and the grace of God are to be attained; confession is alluded to in passing once or twice, but not the intercession of the Virgin and saints, and there is no intimation that the offices of the church are essential. The lesson is taught that man deals directly with God and is responsible to Him alone. Most significant is the remark that many a mass is celebrated which had better have been left unsung, for God does not accept a sacrifice sinfully offered in sin. Wisdom is the one thing for which man should strive—wisdom being obedience to God and a virtuous life, while the examples cited are almost exclusively drawn from classic paganism—Hercules, Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, Penelope, Virgil—though the references to Scripture show adequate acquaintance with Holy Writ. As the embodiment of humanistic teaching, through which Germany, unlike Italy, aspired to moral elevation as well as to classical training, the *Narrenschiff* holds the highest place alike for comprehensiveness and effectiveness.

No more startling comment on this appreciation could perhaps be found than what we may read about the *Narrenschiff* on page 638 of the same volume; where it is stated that Sebastian Brant "published his widely-read and popular poem with intent to counteract the party of rebellion which was then rising. He defended the

²¹ Do, p. 78.

doctrine of the Immaculate Conception; and in the height of his satire he is careful to spare the priesthood."

But if Dr. Barry's testimony should seem open to suspicion as that of a Catholic ecclesiastic, I would refer the reader to the well known Protestant *Realencyclopädie*²² or to the Preface of Zarncke's standard edition of the *Narrenschiff*, in which last we may read such a criticism for instance as the following:

These men, viz., Geller, Brant and Wimpheling, have been looked upon as precursors of the Reformation. But this is seen to be absolutely incorrect, when we consider their aims and the objects they had in view. Their whole life's work was directed to the support of the Catholic Hierarchy. Only minor abuses, a few excrescences that crop up from time to time, did they wish to see cut away.

How earnestly did not Geller strive to make known all Catholic dogma, how near to irony comes his exposition of the doctrine of Indulgences, his comparison of the overflowing fulness of grace in the Church of Christ with the waste basket of the leather cutters. And how seriously does not Brant contend not only for the main truths of Catholicism but also for the absolute authority of the Pope and his Supremacy over the Emperor.

It is a curious fact that in Dr. Lea's list of authorities for his special section, printed at the end of the Cambridge History, occurs the entry, "Brant, S. *Narrenschiff*, ed. F. Farnelle (sic), Leipzig, 1854." Now F. Zarncke's standard edition from which I have just quoted was published at Leipzig in 1854, and in spite of a thorough search in several bibliographies I have been unable to trace any edition by "Farnelle," or any similar name, either in 1854 or at any other date. There is consequently little doubt that by some negligence of the compositors the name Zarncke has been transformed into Farnelle.²⁴ Hence my last quotation is taken from the very edition of Brant which Dr. Lea himself cites as authoritative, though strange to say he is so unfamiliar with it as to have forgotten seemingly the name of the editor. It is this same editor who testifies that Brant's *Narrenschiff* is saturated with allusions to the Canon Law, though Dr. Lea declares it to be based entirely on "classic paganism" and the Bible. Much more might be said on the subject of Sebastian Brant,²⁵ but we must pass on.

Such reckless misrepresentations of questions of fact as we have just been considering seem to me sufficiently unworthy of a serious historian, but they can after all be investigated and refuted. Even

²² *Realencyclopädie für Protestantische Theologie*; (3d Edition) s. v. Brant.

²³ Zarncke, *Sebastian Brant's Narrenschiff*, Introduction, p. 19.

²⁴ The reader will notice that four letters are unchanged; Z appears as F, e as c, and k as ll.

²⁵ Nowhere are Brant's views more unmistakably indicated than in his *Carmina* published in 1500, six years after the *Narrenschiff*. He warmly, almost fiercely, defends the dogma of Immaculate Conception of our Blessed Lady; he has devised an arrangement of fifty sapphic stanzas for saying the Rosary; there is also a devout poem on the Blessed Sacrament, he details the Indulgences to be gained by looking on a picture of the Emblems of the Passion, and he celebrates in verse the glories of the relics of Aix la Chapelle.

more objectionable from many points of view are the sententious generalizations in which Dr. Lea indulges at intervals and which he sets down as maxims of profound wisdom that no well-read person would dream of disputing. Thus we read:

One of the most urgent symptoms of the necessity of a new order of things was the complete divorce between religion and morality.²⁶ A more than Judaic formalism of ceremonies had practically replaced the ethical values of Christianity.²⁷ They (the clergy) were clothed with virtually irresponsible power over their subjects, they were free from the restraints of secular law, and they were condemned to cellhacy in times when no man was expected to be continent.²⁸

Dr. Lea, I may venture to remark, has set down among his authorities Dr. Janssen's *History of the German People*. Can he ever have read a line of it? That this work has its faults may be frankly allowed, but Dr. Janssen writing for Germany, with an extraordinary knowledge of detail, has at least made it clear that the Eve of the Reformation in Central Europe showed no "complete divorce between religion and morality," however great may have been the abuses of the times. Does Dr. Lea think that "the substitution of formalism for ethical Christianity" is exemplified in the lives of Colet, More, and Fisher, of Linacre, Grocyn, and Lupset, of Bishop Alcock, Fox or even Morton, of the Countess of Richmond or Queen Catherine of Arragon? Has he a fragment of evidence to show that there was any deep, much more, any universal corruption among the body of the English clergy who were the contemporaries of these men? When a few years later Henry VIII. sent round his commissioners to rake up all the scandal they could discover, as a justification for the proposed suppression of the religious houses, does Dr. Lea consider that the results were such as to warrant a wholesale indictment of celibacy as a hotbed of vice? Is there no "respect for ethical values" in the productions of Caxton's press? Is there nothing but formalism and priestcraft to be found in such a play as *Everyman*? I speak particularly of England because to the majority of Dr. Lea's readers England is likely to be better known than Europe in general; but with regard to the larger issue one may safely say that if Dr. Lea's sweeping conclusions are justified, then Dr. Barry's chapter on "Catholic Europe" ought never to have been admitted into the volume. It must be the concoction of an unprincipled falsifier of evidence. But I leave it to the penetration of even the most antipapal reader to decide which contribution, Dr. Lea's or Dr. Barry's, shows most signs of the calm judicial spirit befitting the historian.

Lastly there is one of Dr. Lea's axioms which seems to me so peculiarly fantastic as to deserve even at this stage a word of special

²⁶ P. 673.

²⁷ P. 674.

²⁸ Ibid.

notice. Speaking of Staupitz he declares that he was a mystic "strongly imbued with the views of the German mystics of the fourteenth century," and, he adds that "all mysticism is in its essence incompatible with sacerdotalism." It would be interesting to know how much Dr. Lea has read of the mystics of the fourteenth century, of Suso, Tauler, Ruysbroeck, Merswin and the rest, that he should speak so positively of their attitude towards sacerdotalism.²⁹ One mediæval mystic who is not at quite so safe a distance from the general reader as Ruysbroeck or Gerson I would venture to commend to our historian's attention. Does he ever happen to have read the fourth book of the *Imitation of Christ*, and to have noted what Thomas a Kempis there says of the dignity of the priesthood?

And taking that treatise as a whole, a book produced, be it noted, less than a hundred years before the Reformation, would Dr. Lea claim it, I wonder, as illustrating the "substitution of a Judaic formalism for the ethical values of Christianity?" The idea is so preposterous that there is even a certain element of the ludicrous in the very suggestion. If ever in years to come some skilful satirist should give us another "New Lucian," I would respectfully submit that a dialogue between Dr. Henry Charles Lea and the author of the *Imitation*, on "the ethical values of Christianity" would afford promising material for a lively pen.

In the course of this paper I have only been able to touch upon a few points out of the many that offered themselves for notice. A wholly reckless and inaccurate writer like Dr. Lea enjoys a certain immunity from criticism, from the very fact that his misconceptions are so often too fundamental to be investigated in a few minutes or explained in a few lines. The limits of leisure and space preclude the discussion of more than a few choice specimens. But great as may be the industry of Dr. Lea, I believe his capacity for misconception and misrepresentation to be even greater, and the attempts that I have occasionally made to follow up his trail and compare his assertions with his sources, have always ended in a more deeply rooted distrust of every statement made by him. It would be a safe thing probably to say that in any ten consecutive pages ten palpable blunders may be unearthed. At any rate I should like to submit that estimate to the test of experiment. Would Dr. Lea, I wonder, be prepared to accept such a challenge, and to elect to stand or fall by the third volume of his *History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences* or his chapter on the causes of the Reformation in the *Cambridge Modern History*?

HERBERT THURSTON, S. J.

London, England.

²⁹ In the matter of Sacerdotalism I may recommend to Dr. Lea the perusal of Ruysbroeck's *Dat boec vanden gheesteleken Tabernacule*, especially the fifth part. But I am afraid that Dr. Lea only takes his views ready-made from Preger, and with his habitual exaggeration goes beyond him.

JAMES CLARENCE MANGAN.

SORROW and song were, perhaps, never so interwoven in the warp and woof of any human life as in that of the sweet but sad singer of his own and his country's woes whose centenary occurred in May. Yet he does not always strike a minor key, although in much of his writing there is a deep and depressing undertone of grief and gloom. In his prose and verse—for he wrote both with equal facility and felicity—there is an alternation of grave and gay; but his gaiety is somewhat forced and affected, does not come unbidden and spontaneously, gushing and sparkling from the well spring of a joyous spirit.

It is a pitiful story, the life history of this gifted Irish poet, one of the most brilliant of the brilliant galaxy of writers who, in the columns of the *Nation* newspaper, gave impassioned expression in words that breathe and thoughts that burn to the patriotic sentiment evoked in 1848 by the Young Ireland movement. Gavan Duffy—*ultimus Romanorum!*—says he was “essentially the poet of the *Nation*”—no small distinction when we call to mind the names and effusions of Duffy himself, Davis, Lady Wylde (“Speranza”), Brennan, Denis Florence McCarthy, Richard D’Alton Williams, Thomas D’Arcy Magee, Michael Joseph Barry, Denny Lane and others who created the literature of ’48, which, even at this distance of time, still has power to stir Irish hearts; although the Young Ireland of those days has long since grown into the Old Ireland of ours, and age, which brings the philosophic mind to poets and politicians, has cooled the fervor of many ardent spirits.

In one of his best known poems, “The Nameless One,” Mangan has epitomized his own pathetic biography:

Roll forth, my song, like the rushing river,
That sweeps along to the mighty sea;
God will inspire me while I deliver
My soul to thee.

Tell thou the world, when my bones lie whitening
Amid the last homes of youth and old,
That there was once one whose veins ran lightning
No eye beheld.

Tell how his boyhood was one drear night hour,
How shone for him, through his grief and gloom,
No star of all Heaven sends to light our
Path to the tomb.

Roll on, my song, and to after ages
Tell how, disdaining all earth can give,
He would have taught men, from wisdom's pages,
The way to live.

And tell how, trampled, derided, hated,
And worn by weakness, disease, and wrong,
He fled for shelter to God, who mated
His soul with song—

With song which always, sublime or vapid,
 Flowed like a rill in the morning beam;
 Perchance not deep, but intense and rapid—
 A mountain stream.

Tell how this Nameless, condemned for years long
 To herd with demons from hell beneath,
 Saw things that made him, with groans and tears, long
 For even death.

Go on and tell how, with genius wasted,
 Betrayed in friendship, befooled in love,¹
 With spirit shipwrecked and young hope blasted,
 He still, still strove.

Till spent with toil, dreeing death for others,
 And some whose hands should have wrought for him
 (If children live not for sires and mothers),
 His mind grew dim.

And he fell far through that pit abysmal,
 The gulf and grave of Maginn and Burns
 And pawned his soul for the devil's dismal
 Stock of returns—

But yet redeemed it in days of darkness,¹
 And shapes and signs of the final wrath,
 When death, in hideous and ghastly starkness,
 Stood on his path.

And tell how now, amid wreck and sorrow,
 And want and sickness, and houseless nights,
 He bides in calmness the silent morrow
 That no ray lights.

And lives he still, then? Yes, old and hoary
 At thirty-nine, from despair and woe,
 He lives enduring what future story
 Will never know.

Him grant a grave to, ye pitying noble,
 Deep in your bosoms. There let him dwell!
 He, too, had pity for all souls in trouble,
 Here and in hell!

¹ He alludes to his attachment to Miss Margaret Stackpoole, who, it is said, "jilted" him for a friend (?) whom he introduced to her—a commonplace incident enough, but which to one of his supersensitive nature became a source of real suffering. "I had loved," he says, "with all the intense fervor attributed only to the heroes of romance, and here was my requital!" Duffy gives a somewhat different version of this episode. "Shortly after our acquaintance commenced," he relates in his work "My life in Two Hemispheres," "he brought me to visit a County Clare family, Mrs. Stackpoole and her daughters living, I think, in Mount street. I found them agreeable and accomplished and repeated my visit several times, always with Mangan. One night, coming away, he suddenly stopped in the moonlit street and, laying his hands on my shoulders and looking into my face, demanded, 'Isn't it true that you are becoming attached to Margaret?'; and, finally, he said, 'I will save you from my fate by telling you a tragic story. When I knew Margaret first, I was greatly attracted by her charming manners and evident *esprit*. I talked to her of all I did and thought and hoped, and she listened as willingly to me as Desdemona to the Moor. I am not a self-confident man, far from it, and when I besought her to be my wife, I believed I was not asking in vain. What think you I heard? That she was already two years a wife and was living under her maiden name, till her husband returned from an adventure which he had undertaken to improve their fortune? 'You cannot think,' I said, 'that she deceived you intentionally, since you have not broken with her?' 'Ah!' he said, 'she has made my life desolate, but I cannot help returning like the moth to the flame.'"

"It is doubtful," the poet's best biographer² observes, whether in all literature despair and fatalism have ever spoken in such mournful, pitiable accents as in this poem." The allusion therein to Maginn and Burns gives the key to the enigma of a life not wholly wasted but which might have been lived to better purpose. Mangan was a victim or slave to opium and alcohol; yet it was not for the sake of mere sensual indulgence that he had recourse to these stimulants, but in the false and fleeting hope of dispelling a settled melancholy or blotting out sad memories by the aid of the exhilarating and enervating drug or the intoxicating draught. Early in life he suffered from chronic ill health and a nervous super-sensitive temperament, and, later, became a confirmed hypochondriac. In hypochondriasis, a physical malady, we find the origin of most of his woes, which, though greatly exaggerated by a morbid imagination, entailed lifelong suffering.

Like another Irish poet, Moore, he emerged into poetic celebrity from the prosaic precincts of a grocer's shop. It was over a grocer's shop, 3 Fishamble street, Dublin, that Mangan was born on May 1, 1803,³ the memorable year of Emmet's rebellion, if such a street *emeute* could be called a rebellion. It is still, if not exactly a grocer's shop, joined to one, but is known as 3 Lord Edward street, a new street evolved from the topographical changes which have taken place between Corkhill and Christchurch Place. The house in which Mangan was born formerly belonged to the family of the famous Irish antiquary, Archbishop Usher, and the Usher arms are still to be seen under the second floor windows. His father, James Mangan, originally a teacher from Shanagolden, County Limerick, married Miss Catherine Smith of Kiltale, the proprietress of the grocery at No. 3, which he carried on so successfully as to be able to retire from that business and speculate in house property. But his speculations were unsuccessful, his hospitality lavish to extravagance, his savings were lost, and, after eight failures to retrieve his broken fortunes, the result of improvidence, the burthen of contributing to the maintenance of the family mainly devolved upon the eldest son James who, in a fragment of autobiography written at the request of the late Father C. P. Meehan, draws a doleful picture of his early days spent in pinching poverty, toil, and tribulation at home and in the midst of repulsive and uncongenial associations outside. It is to this he alludes when, in the poem quoted, he speaks of his boyhood as "one drear night hour." The picture,

²The *Life and Writings of James Clarence Mangan*. By D. J. O'Donoghue. Edinburgh: Patrick Geddes & Co.

³He was baptized the next day by the venerable Father Betagh in the old chapel in Rosemary lane, and given the name James, to which he afterwards added Clarence.

however, is overdrawn and overcolored; indeed, he frankly admitted to Father Meehan that part of it was purely imaginary and that he had dreamt it. As the whole narrative of his home-life with its sordid details reads like a romance—and some passages are in the style of De Quincey's *Confessions of an Opium-eater*—and remembering that the writer was himself addicted to the frequent use of that deleterious drug, the memoir is to be taken with more than the proverbial grain of salt. It would have been better, for the writer's sake, that it had never been published. There is enough of sombre reality in Mangan's unhappy life, without any of the imaginative or romantic overcoloring, in which he seems to have found a morbid pleasure, to point a moral if it does not adorn a tale. The tale is tear-compelling in its pathos, while the moral is so obvious as to need little or no pointing.

When he was seven years old he was placed in a famous school in Saul's Court off Fishamble street, begun in 1760 by the distinguished Jesuit, Father John Austin, and in which O'Keeffe, the dramatist, Archbishop Murray and several ecclesiastics in their boyhood received their early education. It was situated in a *cul-de-sac* which derived its name from Lawrence Saul, a wealthy Catholic distiller, driven by stress of the iniquitous penal laws to become a self-exile to France, where he died in October, 1768,⁴ the victim of English misrule. This school was afterwards carried on by Father Betagh, one of whose ushers, Michael Courtney, the nominal proprietor of the school, taught Mangan the first rudiments. His successor, Father Michael Blake, afterwards Bishop of Dromore, was struck by young Mangan's proficiency and placed him under the special guidance of Father Graham, a fine classical scholar, to whom he owed those linguistic attainments of which he subsequently made such good use in his inimitable translations. From Father Graham he acquired a knowledge of Latin, French, Italian and Spanish. Father Meehan says he never learnt Gaelic, Persian,

⁴Lawrence Saul was prosecuted for having harbored a young lady named O'Toole, who had sought refuge in his house to avoid being compelled by her friends to conform to the Established Church. It was on the occasion of this trial that Lord Chancellor Bowes declared that the law did not presume that an Irish Papist existed in the kingdom. Advised by Charles O'Connor, who can summon a meeting of the Catholic Committee for the purpose of making a tender of their service and allegiance to Government, Saul replied: "Since there is not the least prospect of such a relaxation of the penal laws as would induce one Roman Catholic to tarry in this house of bondage, who can purchase a settlement in some other land, where freedom and security of property can be obtained, will you condemn me for saying that if I cannot be one of the first, I will not be one of the last, to take flight from a country, where I have not the least expectation of encouragement to enable me to carry on my manufactures to any considerable extent?"

Hindustani, Romaic and Coptic, and that his pretended translations from these idioms were the outcome of his all but Oriental imagination. But he made himself a thorough master of German. Long after Father Graham's death, Mangan often repeated for Father Meehan—the tears streaming from his eyes—the pathetic elegy in which the exiled Ovid tells his wife that the shells on the seashore were outnumbered by the sorrows he had to endure among the barbarous Scythians. "I never can forget," writes Father Meehan, "the broken and tender tones in which he used to read those mournful strophes, all the more so to him, because, as he told me, they were among the first in which Father Graham tested his proficiency, and also because they reflected his own trials and misfortunes—some of the former imaginary or exaggerated and most of the latter of his own making."

When his father's affairs became worse he had to be withdrawn from the more expensive school in Saul's Court and sent to one in Derby Square kept by Courtney, nearly opposite the church in Werburgh street in which Lord Edward Fitzgerald, the chivalrous but ill-fated Geraldine, is buried, and within sight of Mangan's birth-place. This, with a brief sojourn at a school taught by William Browne, in Chancery Lane, is all the schooling Mangan received. He was largely self-taught, and the wonderful proofs of wide-reading in several literatures which in later years he was able to exhibit were the result of many years of close and unhealthy confinement and absorption in books.⁵ He tells us himself that when at home he "sought refuge in books and solitude," shutting himself up in a close room and isolating himself in such a manner from his nearest relations that with one voice they pronounced him mad. "Perhaps I was," he adds. "This much at least is certain, that it was precisely at that period (from my tenth to my fourteenth year) that the seeds of moral insanity were developed within me."

Of his school days, he observes that he attended little to the mere technical instruction given, but rather tried to derive information from general study than from dry rules and special statements. He tells an anecdote to illustrate the condition of his moral and intellectual being at this epoch. It was the first day of his entrance into what he rather euphemistically terms, Mr. Courtney's Academy. "Twenty boys," he relates, "were arranged in a class; and to me, as the latest comer, was allotted the lowest place—a place with which I was perfectly contented. The question propounded by the school-master was, 'What is a parenthesis?' But in vain did he test their philological capacities; one alone attempted some blundering explanation from the grammar; and finally to me, as the forlorn hope

⁵ *Life and Writings*, p. 8.

that might possibly save the credit of the school, was the query referred. 'Sir,' said I, 'I have only come into the school to-day, and I have not had time to look into the grammar; but I should suppose a parenthesis to be something included in a sentence, but which might be omitted from the sentence without injury to the meaning of the sentence.' 'Go up, sir,' exclaimed the schoolmaster, 'to the head of the class.' With an emotion of boyish pride I assumed the place allotted to me; but the next minute found me once more in my original position. 'Why do you go down again, sir?' asked the worthy pedagogue. 'Because, sir,' cried I, boldly, 'I have not deserved the head place; give it to this boy'—and I pointed to the lad who had all but succeeded—'he merits it better, because at least he has tried to study his task.' The schoolmaster smiled; he and the usher whispered together, and I was remanded to a seat apart. On the following day no fewer than three Roman Catholic clergymen, who visited the Academy, condescended to enter into conversation with me; and I very well recollect that one of them, after having heard me read 'Blair on the Death of Christ,' from 'Scott's Lessons,' clapped me on the back, with the exclamation, 'You'll be a rattling fellow, my boy; but see and take care of yourself.' " Alas! poor Mangan, who in after years, to use the words of his own candid confession, "fell far through that pit abysmal, the gulf and grave of Maginn and Burns," forgot the good priest's prophetic premonition, sadly neglected taking care of himself and squandered his health, if not his genius, as improvident of the intellectual gifts with which God and nature had endowed him as his unlucky father was of the means he wasted on worthless investments.

In his early years he was passionately fond of declaiming, indulging in solitary rhapsodies and, not from the ordinary shyness of a home-bred youth, but from a morbid reserve, born of a latent pride in himself, shrinking from intercourse with others on the assumption that they were alien from his nature and unsympathetic. He was a dreamer of dreams and contact with the stern realities of life, instead of curing him of his dreaminess, only aggravated this mental malady. When, for instance, the *res angustæ domi*, the needs of an impoverished family, necessitated his becoming a wage-earner, his super-sensitive nature recoiled from the associates among whom it threw him. "Taken from my books," he says, "obliged to relinquish my solitary rambles and musings, and compelled for the miserable pittance of a few shillings weekly to herd with the coarsest associates, and suffer at their hands every sort of rudeness and indignity which their uncultivated and savage natures prompted them to inflict upon me."

He was first apprenticed to the scrivenry in 1818 in an office in

York street, Stephen's Green, carried on by the Rev. Richard Kenrick for the benefit of the widow and children of his brother, Thomas Kenrick. One of the sons of the latter had just left the office in order to study for the priesthood, and his brother was still employed there during Mangan's apprenticeship. It is a remarkable fact, notes Mr. D. J. O'Donoghue,⁶ that both those brothers became Catholic Archbishops, and were respectively the late Most Rev. Francis Patrick and Peter Richard Kenrick, Archbishops of Baltimore and St. Louis. That Mangan's conduct was unexceptionable at this time we have the testimony of the Archbishop P. R. Kenrick, who wrote as follows from St. Louis on October 19, 1887, to Mr. John McCall, Dublin: "I knew James Mangan for several years very intimately, and highly esteemed him for his talents and virtue. My brother, the late Archbishop of Baltimore, never had any knowledge of him. After my father's death, in 1817, his office was continued for some years, in which both Mangan and myself were engaged." The business being discontinued in 1825, he entered the office of a Mr. Franks in Merrion Square and subsequently that of Mr. Leland in Fitzwilliam Square and his successor, Mr. Murphy.

"He had hardly set out on life's journey," observes Father Meehan, "when he discovered that he had fallen into the society of grovelling companions who flouted the temperate cup and made him ever afterwards an irresolute victim to alcohol."⁷ This must have been after he left Kenrick's; and this, and not his father's improvidence or harshness, was the fountain and origin of nearly all his misfortunes, as it has been of many others of his countrymen. The first intoxicating draught was really the first downward step towards "the pit abysmal;" it was the little rift within the lute which by and bye made mute the music of a soul "mated to song" and finally silenced all in a premature death. But it was not the quantity he drank so much as the fatal effect of the fiery liquid upon him which made him so early fall a victim to the drink evil. "This one passion," says Father Meehan, "claimed him exclusively for its own, rendering him misanthropical and eccentric, for the smallest amount of spirit seriously affected his finely strung nerves and delicate fibre."

It must be recorded to his credit that he made more than one effort, though fitful and ineffectual, to cure himself of the drink habit. Now and again he would reappear after an interval of absence almost completely restored to sobriety and a regular mode of life, to the joy of his numerous friends. The marvellous moral revolution wrought by the great temperance crusade preached by the illustrious Irish Capuchin, Father Theobald Mathew, impressed him so much that for whole months he would avoid the use of alcohol. In one of

⁷ Biographical sketch prefixed to "The Poets and Poetry of Munster."

his temperate intervals at this period he formally abjured (in verse, Mr. O'Donoghue parenthetically interjects) his excessive indulgence in stimulants. The abjuration is entitled "The Coming Event," and runs thus:

Curtain the lamp and bury the bowl,
 The ban is on drinking.
 Reason shall reign the queen of the soul
 When the spirits are sinking.
 Chained is the demon that smote with blight
 Men's morals and laurels.
 Then hail to health and a long good night
 To old wine and new quarrels!

Nights shall descend and no taverns ring
 To the roar of our revels;
 Mornings shall dawn, but none of them bring
 White lips and blue devils.
 Riot and frenzy sleep with remorse
 In the obsolete potion,
 And mind grows calm as a ship on her course
 O'er the level of ocean.

So should it be! for man's world of romance
 Is fast disappearing,
 And shadows of changes are seen in advance,
 When epochs are nearing.
 And the days are at hand when the best shall require
 All means of salvation;
 And the souls of men shall be tried in the fire
 Of the final probation!

And the winking no longer or sneers or smiles—
 And the worldling dissembles,
 And the black-hearted skeptic feels anxious at whiles
 And marvels and trembles,
 And fear and defiance are blent in the jest
 Of the blind self-deceiver;
 But hope bounds high in the joyous breast
 Of the child-like believer.

Darken the lamp, then, and shatter the bowl,
 Ye faithfulest-hearted!
 And as your swift years travel on to the goal
 Whither worlds have departed,
 Spend labor, life, soul in your zeal to atone
 For the past and its errors;
 So best shall ye bear to encounter alone
 The event and its terrors!

A similar revulsion of feeling against inebriety found expression in a poem he sent to a friend after a promise to "conquer his every social weakness:"

Farewell to the sparkling wine cup!
 The brain-deceiving wine cup!
 The cup that slays a thousand ways,
 The soul-degrading wine cup!

Farewell to the revelling wine cup!
 The flattering, fooling wine cup!
 The cup that snares, that sinks and wears,
 The fame-defiling wine cup!

Farewell to the tempting wine cup!
 The danger-scoffing wine cup!
 An upas tree, my land, to thee,
 Is the baneful, stainful wine cup!"

Though he had refused, previous to his acquaintance with Father Meehan, to take any temperance pledge, even when Father Mathew himself administered it outside the Church of SS. Michael and John to a large number of people in his presence, he did subsequently take it on several occasions, mainly through Father Meehan's earnest advice, but speedily broke it.⁸ In a letter to James McGlashan (the canny Scotch publisher⁹ who coined money out of the poor poet's brains) he writes: "I now propose, as far as possible, to retrieve the past. . . . That I might not be tempted to relapse into my old habits, I have renewed my vow of abstinence." Again: "I have now no longer the same motive for requesting money from you which, unfortunately, I too often had on former occasions. In other words, I am now and henceforth a water-drinker." He would voluntarily abstain, sometimes for weeks, from drink, though it was evident to all who knew him that he suffered agonies in the effort.¹⁰ O'Donovan says he broke the pledge four or five times.

The sternest moralist cannot but feel pity for one who erred more through feebleness of will than moral obliquity, as his efforts at amendment, candid confessions of weakness, and compunctious visitings attest. In a letter to McGlashan he says: "I would entreat of you not to judge me over harshly for my great past lapses. Men see effects. It is for God alone to scrutinize causes. I leave myself in future to be tested by my acts, not my promises. A retributive eternity is rapidly coming upon me, and woe unto me now and forever if I fail to fulfil the mission allotted to me." In response to some verses by Joseph Brennan in the *Irishman*, appealing to him "to live his poetry and act his rhyme," he wrote:

Truly showest thou me the one thing needful!
 Thou art not, nor is the world yet blind.
 Truly have I been long years unheedful
 Of the thorns and tares that choked the weedful
 Garden of my mind!
 Thorns and tares which rose in rank profusion
 Round my scanty fruitage and my flowers,
 Till I almost deemed it self-delusion
 Any attempt or glance at their extrusion
 From their midnight bowers.
 Oft, with tears, I have groaned to God for pity—
 Oft gone wandering till my way grew dim—
 Oft sung unto Him a prayerful ditty—
 Oft, all lonely in this thoughtful city,
 Raised my soul to Him!
 And from path to path His mercy tracked me—
 From many a peril snatched He me,
 When false friends pursued, betrayed, attacked me,
 When gloom overdarkened and sickness racked me,
 He was by to save and free!

⁸ Life and Writings, p. 147.

⁹ Of the firm of McGlashan and Gill, now M. H. Gill & Son, Dublin.

¹⁰ Life and Writings, p. 164.

Yes! to live a bard, in thought and feeling!
 Yes! to act my rhyme by self-restraint,
 This is truth's, is reason's deep revealing,
 Unto me from thee, as God's to a kneeling
 And entranced saint!

Notwithstanding his inebriety and opium-eating, Mangan was a clean-minded and clean living man in a moral sense, and always a fervent Catholic at heart. Father Meehan, who had much of his confidence, vouches for this. "Something," says Mitchell, "saved him from insanity—perhaps it was religion." Mr. O'Donoghue¹¹ notes as "in some respects the most astonishing feature of his career that even in his deepest, most abysmal misery and despair and suffering,¹² he never lost his religious faith. He was interested in many religions, in many of the world's religious teachers, but his early convictions remained intact, and personally, apart from his habit of drinking, his conduct was irreproachable enough. At the approach of death his muse became more religious than ever, and his reading lay more and more in religious books." In the fragment of autobiography already referred to he relates: "To the religious duties enjoined by my Church I had always been attentive, but I now became deeply devotional, addicted myself to ascetic practices and studied the lives of the saints¹³ with the profoundest admiration of their grand and extraordinary virtues. If my mind had been of a larger and sterner order, all this had been well enough and I should doubtless have reaped nothing but unmixed advantage from my labours. But, constituted as I was, the effect of these upon me was rather injurious than beneficial. I gradually became disquieted by doubts, not of the great truths of faith—for these I never questioned—but my own capacity, so to speak, for salvation."

Then, for about twelve months, his mind was clouded by dark and dismal thoughts upon which he brooded, until the cloudiness was gradually dispelled by the illuminating influence of prayer to which one of his spiritual advisers wisely counselled him to have recourse. In reading this passing episode of his life one cannot put aside the thought that it was not merely a fine intellect which was prematurely quenched, but a soul susceptible of higher things that was arrested in its progress by a weakness of will which yielded itself a prey to debasing habits.

In the employment obtained for him by Dr. Todd from Dr. Wall, the then librarian of Trinity College, and in contributing to some

¹¹ *Life and Writings*, p. 126.

¹² Lamartine's poem, "Farewell to France," which he considered the finest thing he ever did, he told McGlashan was written in pencil reclining against a haystack after a fast of thirty-six hours.

¹³ He had a special veneration for St. Francis of Assisi and would talk of him for hours.

minor periodicals—most of which had only an ephemeral existence—he found more congenial occupation than in the daily drudgery of a scrivener's or lawyer's office. His earliest poems appeared in 1818. There were then hardly any literary periodicals in Ireland, and the Dublin and Belfast almanacs were the recognized receptacles in Ireland for the abundant poetical output of rhymesters all over the country.¹⁴ For these Mangan wrote frequently from 1818 to 1826. From 1826 to 1831 he did very little literary work.

One of the earliest publications to which Mangan contributed was a satirical paper called *The Comet*, then engaged in a controversial conflict with the Rev. Tresham Gregg and Cæsar Otway, two noted Protestant hot-gospellers. It was founded in 1831 and was the organ of a club who took the popular side in the struggle against the levying of tithes upon Catholic farmers for the maintenance of the Protestant Church. Its leading members were Joseph Sterling Coyne, afterwards eminent as a dramatist, humorist and contributor to *Punch*; Samuel Lover, whose powerful etchings, O'Donoghue says, did as much for the agitation as any of the satires in prose and verse; Thomas Browne, editor of *The Comet* and one of the authors of *The Parson's Horn Book*, which scarified the Government and the tithe receivers; Norreys Jephson, M. P. for Mallow; John Sheehan, the sub-editor of *The Comet*, who was afterwards one of the chief writers for *Bentley's Miscellany* and *Temple Bar*; John Cornelius O'Callaghan, the historian of "The Irish Brigades in the Service of France" and the author of "The Green Book;" Maurice O'Connell, the witty and poetical son of the Liberator; Robert Knox, who eventually became editor of the *London Morning Herald*; Thomas Kennedy, author of "The Uninscribed Tomb" and "Reminiscences of a Silent Agitator;" Dominic Ronayne, later a Cork M. P., whom Sheehan describes as "the most sparkling and classic writer of English prose in any publication of his time," and lastly Mangan, who began to write for *The Comet* when it was over a year in existence. They were thorough Bohemians and foregathered at a tavern in Church Row off Dame street. They did not understand or appreciate Mangan, who, on his part, did not relish their chaffing and roystering and withdrew from the club. In an autobiographical sketch in which he speaks of himself in the third person he says: "They (the editors of *The Comet*) tried to corrupt him, but failed. He wrote for them gratuitously. But when he attended at their drinking bouts, he always sat at the table with a glass of water before him." James Price, who met him frequently at the club, "always found 'Clarence'—the signature appended to his early literary productions—the same simple, inno-

¹⁴ *Life of Mangan* by D. J. O'Donoghue, p. 17.

cent creature, full of that fresh romance which, at the touch of an enchanter's wand, summons up shapes of beauty and glory. . . . He was the least worldly being we ever met. His sensibilities were keen and easily excitable, and his whole organization, physical and mental, was instinct with genius. A peculiar feature of his character was the intense melancholy that rested upon him continually like a shadow. No matter how great the festivity—how bright the faces surrounding him—a deep gloom would suddenly fall upon 'Clarence,' a gloom that he could not shake off." The best poems he wrote for *The Comet* were "The Dying Enthusiast" and "Life is the Desert and the Solitude." The former he republished in the *Dublin Penny Journal*, in which also appeared "The One Mystery," a similar poem; "Enthusiasm" and a version of Schiller's "Lament of Ceres." His connection with this famous periodical, which counted among its contributors the most eminent writers in prose and verse and notable antiquaries, brought him into association with Petrie and O'Donovan, who befriended him in after life. It was through the influence of Petrie he obtained employment as a copyist in the office of the Ordnance Survey, 21 Great Charles street, near Mountjoy Square. "It is almost certain that Mangan began to drink heavily while here," Mr. O'Donoghue avers. "From this date Mangan's downward course is traceable step by step."

Previous to this he began to write for the *Dublin University Magazine*, to which he was a voluminous contributor and in which appeared much of his best work. His contributions it is calculated would fill a dozen good sized volumes, or considerably more than a thousand closely-printed double columns of the magazine. Even if he had only obtained ten guineas a sheet¹⁵ from McGlashan, the publisher, his earnings from the magazine alone, his biographer computes, would not have been less than £70 or £80 a year, which, with £78 on an average from the Ordnance Survey, should have certainly removed him to a safe distance from want. He was a prolific writer, having written over eight hundred poems.¹⁶ O'Donoghue says there can be no doubt that, had he wished, he might have become as distinguished in prose as in verse and that had he written for *Fraser* or *Blackwood* his reputation in the world of literature would be vastly greater than it is. In one respect he resembled a fellow-countryman, Father Francis Mahony, one of the most notable of the contributors to *Fraser*, being much addicted, as he admits, to fathering upon other writers the offspring of his own brain, as in his pretended translations from Arabic, Turkish, Persian and other

¹⁵ The usual rate was sixteen guineas.

¹⁶ At least 500 poems by him, besides a considerable quantity of prose appeared in the *University Magazine* between 1834 and 1849.

Oriental tongues; just as the linguistic whimsicalities of Mahony were ascribed to Father Prout, "the lone incumbent of Watergrass hill."

He was a constant reader and admirer of Maginn's brilliant writings in *Blackwood*, and it is somewhat singular that he did not, like either of his compatriots and contemporaries, look to London for a medium of reaching and attracting the public. Mitchell seems to have discovered the reason. "Mangan," he says, "was not only an Irishman—not only an Irish Papist, not only an Irish Papist rebel, but throughout his whole literary life he never deigned to attorn to English criticism, never published a line in any English periodical, or through any English bookseller, and never seemed to be aware that there was an English public to please."

With the exception of translations from Petrarch and Filicaja in the *Dublin Penny Journal*, the majority of his translations, chiefly from the German, appeared in the *Dublin University Magazine*, during the fifteen years he enriched its pages with his contributions. The reader will search in vain for one or more of these German authors, for they had no existence except in his own fertile imagination. They began with Schiller's "Pilgrim" and were reprinted in 1845 under the title of "German Anthology" in two volumes, Gavan Duffy generously defraying the expenses of publication.

The congenial association with Petrie, O'Curry and O'Donovan had breathed a fresh patriotic inspiration into his receptive mind and gave his genius a more distinctly national bent. But stirring events were at hand which were destined to exercise a still more marked influence upon him in the same direction and to kindle into white heat the warmth of his patriotism. The appearance of the first number of the *Nation* in October, 1842, was epoch-making. It was Mangan who wrote the splendid inaugural ode which adumbrated the grand aim of that journal. Its gifted editor, Charles Gavan Duffy—the veteran patriot, statesman and historian of the Young Ireland movement, who, full of years and of honors, passed away at Nice on February 9th of this year—conceived an affectionate regard for the poet, to whom he had been introduced by Carleton in the office of the *Register*. "I knew and loved him," he says, "from the time when I was not yet a man." "The man most essentially a poet among the writers of the *Nation*," he declares,¹⁷ "was Clarence Mangan. He was as truly born to sing deathless songs as Keats or Shelley; but he lived and died in a provincialised city, and his voice was drowned for a time in the roar of popular politics. He was so purely a poet that he shrank from all other exercise of his intellect. He cared little for political projects. He could never be induced to

¹⁷ *Young Ireland, a Fragment of Irish History*, Vol. I., p. 137.

attend the weekly suppers, and knew many of his fellow labourers only by name. He lived a secluded, unwholesome life, and when he emerged into daylight he was dressed in a blue cloak (midsummer or midwinter) and a hat of fantastic shape, under which golden hair as fine and silky as a woman's hung in unkempt tangles, and deep blue eyes lighted a face as colourless as parchment. He looked like the spectre of some German romance, rather than a living creature. He stole into the editor's room once a week to talk over literary projects, but if any of my friends appeared he took flight on the instant. In earlier days I had spent many a night up to the small hours listening to his delightful monologues on poetry and metaphysics, but the animal spirits and hopefulness of vigorous young men oppressed him, and he fled from the admiration or sympathy of a stranger as others do from reproach or insult." Father Meehan has borne testimony¹⁸ to how fondly attached Duffy was to him and how lovingly but vainly he strove to recall him to his better self. He tells to the credit of the distinguished editor of the ablest newspaper of the time in Ireland that, all Mangan's tergiversations notwithstanding, he always proved himself his apologist. "May God bless him!" wrote the grateful poor fellow; "he has been to me the sincerest friend I ever had." Davis engaged Maddyn's aid to make Clarence Mangan better known to the lovers of poetry in England but unsuccessfully. It was to the *Nation* that Mangan contributed his most spirited national poems. "Hitherto," says Mr. O'Donoghue, "he had been contented with the name of 'poet,' he now appeared as the great national poet of Ireland—the most splendidly endowed with imagination and keenness of vision of any Irishman of his time." His best and best remembered and most admired poems, "Dark Rosaleen," "A Vision of Connaught in the Thirteenth Century," "The Dream of John McDonnell," "Shane Bwee," "A Cry for Ireland," "A Warning Voice" and "The Peal of Another Trumpet," in which there is a strain of prophetic foresight, appeared in the *Nation*, to which he willingly gave the best fruits of his genius. For a short time he seceded from the paper to help Mitchel in founding the *United Irishman*, but when after sixteen issues Mitchell's paper was suppressed and its successor, the *Tribune*, had shared the same fate,²⁰ he returned to the *Nation*. Though Duffy does not credit him with any strong political convictions, there is evidence enough, apart from his national poetry, that he had caught the contagion of the patriotic fever which then stirred the young blood of

¹⁸ Biographical sketch prefixed to the translations of the "Poets of Munster."

¹⁹ *Life and Writings*, pp. 159-160.

²⁰ He only wrote three poems for the *United Irishman* and one for the *Tribune*.

Ireland and made their hearts throb. When Mitchel was threatened with prosecution after the fifth number of his paper appeared, Mangan wrote to him saying that he was identically of the same views on public affairs and was prepared to go all lengths with him and his intrepid friend, Devin O'Reilly, for the achievement of national independence. Mitchel, like Duffy, formed a high opinion of him. "He had no malignity," he says, "sought no revenge, never wrought sorrow and suffering to any human being but himself. In his deadly struggle with the cold world he wore no defiant air and attitude, was always humble and affectionate, almost prayerful. His manner and voice were always extremely gentle, and I never heard him blame anybody but himself." It was in the library of Trinity College he first saw him, and he has given an admirable impressionist pen-portrait of the poet. "The present biographer," he writes, "being in the College Library and having occasion for a book in that gloomy apartment called the Fagel Library, which is the innermost recess of the stately building, an acquaintance pointed out to him a man perched on the top of a ladder with the whispered information that the figure was Clarence Mangan. It was an unearthly and ghostly figure in a brown garment; the same garment to all appearance which lasted till the day of his death. The blanched hair was totally unkempt; the corpse-like features still as marble; a large book was in his arms, and all his soul was in the book. I had never heard of Clarence Mangan before, and knew not for what he was celebrated; whether as a magician, a poet, or a murderer; yet took a volume and spread it on a table, not to read, but with pretence of reading to gaze on the spectral creature upon the ladder." This corpse-like appearance was the unmistakable alabaster shine which indicates the opium eater. And here it may be parenthetically observed that Miss Imogen Guiney in the memoir prefixed to her selection of his poems in which she draws a portrait, more or less idealized, of the poet, quotes Dr. Sigerson, of Dublin, and an American physician in favor of the theory that it was to opium alone and not alcohol that Mangan was addicted. It is contended that his handwriting does not present the signs of one whose nervous system was shattered by alcohol and that it is pathologically impossible that a man could be a drunkard and an opium eater at the same time. In 1887 when a certain Dublin barrister, in the course of a lecture on Irish poets, incidentally referred to Mangan as a victim of the drink evil, Father Meehan, who was present, interrupted the lecturer with the exclamation, "There is not a word of truth in that." From this it may be inferred that Father Meehan had altered his previous opinion and adopted that of Professor Sigerson.

To Duffy's *Catholic Magazine*, published in 1847, Mangan con-

tributed a metrical paraphrase of the first chapter of the Lamentations of the Prophet Jeremias, "The death and burial of Red Hugh O'Donnell," the "Legend of Claus of Unterwalden," and a translation of the grand liturgical hymn, *Te Deum laudamus*, commonly known as the hymn of St. Ambrose, but which Father Meehan ascribes to St. Nicetus, bishop of Treves in 527. "The Poets and Poetry of Munster," a selection of Irish poems by Munster poetasters or minor poets of the eighteenth century, was first published in 1849. For this he received such scanty remuneration as John O'Daly, the bookseller, of Anglesea street—at one time the Paternoster Row of Dublin—could afford. Mangan, who began to learn Irish in 1846, did not know it sufficiently to translate freely from it, and it was O'Daly who turned the Gaelic songs in that volume into English prose, transformed by Mangan into melodious verse into which his intuitive genius transfused the spirit and essence of the original. "The value of the work," says Father Meehan, who edited a later edition, "was greatly enhanced by the native music which escaped Bunting, Moore, Petrie and other collectors of our ancient minstrelsy." It does not, however, contain his best Irish poems, which appeared in the *Irish Penny Journal*. It was O'Curry who made literal renderings of "The Woman of Three Cows" and the elegy "O Woman of the Piercing Wail," which Lord Jeffrey admired so much. Carleton considered "Kathleen-ny-Houlahan" the best thing he ever did. In nearly every case he paraphrased freely, his version of "O'Hussey's Ode to the Maguire" being closest to the original. Mr. O'Donoghue says very aptly of his exquisite poems "Dark Rosaleen" and "A Cry for Ireland," that they are rather voluntaries upon Irish themes than translations. The same may be said of his German translations. Very few poets, his biographer elsewhere observes, have succeeded so triumphantly in producing translations which are not merely faithful in spirit, but are at the same time really first-rate as poems; and though, to secure this end, he has sometimes deviated a good deal from the precise meaning of the German poet, he always inimitably reproduces the spirit. His views upon German poetry are highly interesting and amusing; and he has humorously exhibited its peculiarities in papers which it is no exaggeration to say are quite equal to Prout's *Reliques*.²¹ He assimilated the contents of whatever interested him so thoroughly that he was able to project himself into the mind of the author, and to identify himself completely with his thoughts. Hence his wondrous skill as a translator, whether from the Irish, the Turkish or the German.²² He contributed very few translations from the German to

²¹ *Life and Writings*, pp. 72-73.

²² *Op cit.*, p. 146.

the *Nation* after the spring of 1846. Almost all his poems thenceforward were Irish in subject. When the terrible famine year, black '47, came and the angel of death hovered over the doomed land, a more serious and solemn tone pervaded his poems, in several of which he depicts with lurid effect the dismal and desolating scourge which devastated the country.

Father Meehan has given us a very graphic sketch of Mangan. "My first interview with him," he writes, "was in 1845, a few days after the appearance of the *German Anthology*, when a gentleman employed on the *Nation* brought him to my attic and formally introduced me to the author of the exquisite translations of which I had spoken rapturously. Before taking a seat, Mangan ran his hand through my hair phrenologically, but whether he discovered anything to his or my advantage I don't remember. The close proximity, however, made me recognize the strange individual I had often seen standing before bookstalls at the Four Courts, the College Wall, and elsewhere. He was about five feet six or seven, slightly stooped, and attenuated as one of Memling's monks. His head was large, beautifully shaped, his eyes blue, his features exceedingly fine and 'sicklied o'er' with that diaphanous pallor which is said to distinguish those in whom the fire of genius has burnt too rapidly even from childhood. And the dress of this spectral-looking man was singularly remarkable, taken down haphazard from some peg in an old clothes shop—a baggy pantaloon that never was intended for him, a short coat closely buttoned, a blue cloth cloak still shorter, and tucked so tightly to his person that no one could see there even the faintest shadow of those lines called by painters and sculptors drapery. The hat was in keeping with this habiliment, broad-leafed and steeple-shaped, the model of which he must have found in some picture of Hudibras. Occasionally he substituted for this headgear a soldier's fatigue cap, and never appeared abroad in sunshine or storm without a large malformed umbrella, which, when partly covered by the cloak, might easily be mistaken for a Scotch bagpipe. This eccentricity in costume and manner was not affected, and so little did he heed the incidents passing about him that he never was conscious of the remarks and glances bestowed on him by the empty-headed fop who stared him in the streets. The acquaintance formed that evening was destined to live through five eventful years; and thenceforth Mangan was always welcome to such modest fare as a poor attic could afford." Among those whom he used to meet there were Thomas D'Arcy Magee, Richard D'Alton Williams, and Denis Florence McCarthy and others whom he delighted with his *vis à vis* criticisms of the Italian, German or French poets or entertained with dissertations on phrenology, in which he was a firm believer.

During the intervals of sobriety and self-denial, which followed the advent of Father Mathew to the metropolis, he endeared himself more and more to his companions, frequented the sacraments, and scrupulously kept faith with those who had secured his valued literary services. "What joyous evenings we had then in that attic," says Father Meehan, "listening to his anecdotes of crazed Maturin²³—in some measure his own *menechme* or *alter ego*—whom he used to follow through the streets; Dr. Brennan of *Milesian Magazine* notoriety, Sir Harcourt Lees and other eccentrics with whose vagaries he was thoroughly acquainted! On one of those evenings he, for the first time, heard one of his own most pathetic lyrics, 'The Time of the Barmecides,' mated to a sweet old Irish air by Dr. Thomas Nedley, then a student of medicine and gifted with a dulcet tenor voice, that often and often made our reunions all the more charming." Host and guests who mingled song and jest and joyous laughter in what Father Meehan facetiously calls an "attic" (where the conversation was not unseasoned with Attic salt) but which was in reality an upper room in the presbytery of SS. Michael and John's, have disappeared, and their places know them no more. Dr. Nedley, whose wit rivalled that of Father Healy of Little Bray, was one of the last of those whose

* * * songs melodious
Flung a glorious madness o'er the festive board

to follow Father Meehan to the bourne from whence no traveller returns. "The Time of the Barmecides," which Mangan considered the best thing he had ever written, was set by Nedley to the old air of "Billy Byrne of Ballymanus," and Mangan was so charmed with the song that he gave Nedley an autograph copy of the poem which was religiously preserved.

"But ah, the pity of it!" reflects Meehan. "Waywardness and irresolution were strongly developed in Mangan, and despite words of encouragement and gentle attentions, he would, at intervals, be missed for weeks and months from the little circle in the attic, none knowing whither he had gone till he himself would suddenly turn up, and tell how he had been to Leixlip or Kiltale, suffering from fever, of which he would cure himself with draughts of Bishop Berkeley's nostrum—tar water."

²³ The famous author of *Bertram* and *Malmoe the Wanderer* lived at 41 York street when Mangan was serving his time to the scriverny at No. 6. Maturin (whose kinsman, an ex-Cowley Father, is now ably filling the place left vacant by the lamented Rev. Dr. Rivington, another convert from the Anglican brotherhood at Oxford) was a very familiar figure in Dublin streets in the first half of the last century. He was, though very eccentric, an eloquent preacher as a Protestant divine. Sir Walter Scott offered to edit his works after his death and Byron strove to get a hearing for his plays.

His habits were very nomadic. He was always moving about from place to place, not from necessity, but choice. Duffy, the publisher, made him an offer of bed and board in his house on Wellington Quay, and a fair allowance of money, and Father Kenyon wanted him to live with him in the parochial house, Templeberry. But his nomadic propensities, his ineradicable Bohemianism, his dread of restraint and love of a kind of wild freedom made him decline the good-natured offers of his friends who wished to save him from himself despite himself. He now began to estrange himself more and more from his friends. One day Father Meehan found him and his brother in a miserable back room destitute of every comfort. On expostulating with him, he vowed that he would endeavor to retrieve himself and make amends for the past. But promises of amendment were no sooner made than broken, such is the tyranny of habit. A hypochondriac and fatalist, he had become possessed of the insane idea that his life would have a tragic ending and that he could not struggle against fate.

In an appealing letter to Duffy he describes himself as "utterly prostrated" and "in a state of absolute desolation of spirit" and implores him "for the pity of God" to come to him; adding that he was hardly able to hold the pen. To one whom he calls "the most distinguished philanthropist of our era" he writes from "a fireless and furnitureless room with a sick brother near me whom I have supported for years." And yet, in the midst of all this gloom and misery he produced poems of transcendent beauty.

The two last years of his life were spent in the same erratic and irresolute mood. Every effort of his friends to bring him back to the right path failed. Weary of life and broken in health and spirits, he was admitted to St. Vincent's Hospital in May, 1848—a pale ghost-like creature, with snow-white hair tossed over his lordly forehead, and falling lankly on either side of a face handsome in outline, bloodless and wrinkled, though not with age. Carried up to St. Patrick's ward, his weird blue eyes, distraught with the opium-eater's dreams, closed beneath their heavy lids, and his head fell back in sleep just as it is pictured fallen back in death by Frederick William Burton's magical pencil.²⁴ Denied the use of stimulants and longing like Trowbridge's vagabond for "something warm to stop a horrible inward sinking," or mayhap for the delusive and delirium-producing drug which was his bane, he fled from the hospital and the kindly care of the good Sisters of Charity—those true "daughters of Vincent de Paul" whose hands are always "tending the helpless or lifted for them"—and relapsed into the old slough of despond. A few mornings after he was a patient in the Richmond Surgical Hos-

²⁴ "Life of Mary Aikenhead," by Mrs. Atkinson.

pital, bruised and disfigured by a fall at night time of nearly fifteen feet into the foundation of a house then recently sunk. His health was gone, he had lost the free use of his limbs from weakness and lack of nourishment, and early in June, 1849, he was stricken down with cholera. He was removed to the temporary sheds at Kilmainham, but was allowed to leave after a few days, when he was thought to be nearly well. But he was past recovery, and on the 13th was found dying in the cellar of an obscure house in Bride street. By the advice of Dr. Stokes, who pronounced his case hopeless, he was removed to the Meath Hospital. The late Miss Margaret Stokes, the distinguished Irish artist and antiquarian writer, in a letter to Mr. D. J. O'Donoghue says: "My father watched over him lovingly for three days, till he died. One morning he turned on his pillow and said to him: 'You are the first man who has spoken a kind word to me for years.'" Dr. Stokes conveyed to Father Meehan poor Mangan's earnest desire to see him, and the good priest lost no time in going to the pesthouse, then filled with the dying. On taking a chair at his bedside, the poor fellow playfully said to him: "I feel that I am going. I know that I must go 'unhousel'd' and 'unanel'd,' but you must not let me go 'unshriven' and 'unanointed.'" The chaplain was sent for, heard his confession and administered Extreme Unction. On the 20th of June, the seventh day after his admission, he died without a trace of suffering, without a pang to tell the moment his spirit passed away. With hands crossed on his breast and eyes uplifted, manifesting sentiments of the most edifying piety, and with a smile upon his lips he faintly ejaculated, "O Mary, Queen of Mercy!" Mitchel says that at his own request they read him, during his last moments of life, one of the Catholic penitential hymns.

Thus passed away the greatest of the *Nation* poets. Hercules Ellis, an Irish barrister, says he died an honor to his country by his writings, a disgrace to it by his deplorable fate.

Immediately after death such a wonderful change came over his face that Dr. Stokes, who made a cast of it, hurried away to Mr. F. W. Burton (Sir Frederick Burton, then a young and rising artist) and said to him: "Clarence Mangan is lying dead at the hospital. I want you to come and look at him, for you never saw anything so beautiful in your life." He went at once and made the drawing which, at a later period and at the request of Mr. Henry Doyle, he presented to the National Gallery, Dublin. "The sight of poor Mangan," he said, "as he lay in the mortuary, with head unsupported, and the long, partially gray hair fallen back from the fine and delicately shaped forehead, was intensely interesting and pathetic."

Although the burial rite should have followed fast on the decease, his remains were not interred till Friday, June 23, because of the difficulty of procuring either coffin or hearse owing to the awful mortality then desolating the city. He was buried in Glasnevin, only five people, according to Brennan (Father Meehan says three), following him to the grave, marked by a modest headstone erected by a kinsman.

R. F. O'CONNOR.

Dublin, Ireland.

TENNYSONIAN SEA-ECHOES.

BOURNEMOUTH! A lustrous spring evening, fleecy clouds crawling across the violet abysses of the sky! The quivering, shivering sea—where the dazzling pyramid of effulgence from the molten mass of the setting sun glowed on it—gleaming like burnished fretted-silver inlaid in rosewood. Canford Cliffs, beneath which we stood, were incarnadined by the level rays of the sinking orb, now superbly large. Thence nature's masterpiece lay spread out before our gaze. And what a glorious scene this was of England's Riviera! Fronting us, off to the left, stood out the Needles, stiff and distinct, the rest of the island robed in a filmy web of silver mist—the Isle of Wight, rich in memories of that Tennyson whose cunning hand had word-painted, so often and so well, visions of nature-beauty such as this. To our right stretched Poole harbor, a busy emporium once but dying now to trade, though fated to survive in men's memories because immortalized by the magic brush of genius—Turner's. At our backs rose the gravelly cliffs, scored and scarred by countless rivulets of surface waters trickling to the beach. And, across a narrow stretch of smooth sand, sportive wavelets rippled lazily towards our feet lippping the beach.

In silence, for a space, we stood, musing, contemplating the picture—four of us. One a barrister, in the prime of life, unsentimental nor overfond of those airy nothings whereof the warp and woof of a poet's dreams are knit, but matter-of-fact, clear-headed, breezy-minded, with keen laughter cutting the knot of many a sophistry. One a lady, not unknown to literary fame, dainty, artistic, refined, her soft eyes and silvery voice the index of a melodious soul sweetly attuned to a fair body. The third was a man nearing the bisection of a century, a metaphysician, versed in the subtleties of over-nice distinctions, a little pedantic, and yet withal healthy and athletic, with a vein of satire not always successfully concealed. The fourth was

not much more than an onlooker and a listener—myself. Such the quartette.

I remarked how still were sky and sea.

Lady. Yes, now! But only last night, what a storm! At first, sounds of strangled thunder over Swanage; then, right overhead, such a crash of heaven's artillery that the world seemed to stagger under the blow; in heavy battalions the murky clouds marched across the fields of heaven; the wind howled like a fettered soul fretting to be free; and rain, wind, and waves confounded together their tremendous sound. This sea, so gentle now, seemed to me an awful orator, with eloquent roar preaching the Divine.

Professor. Even now, I fancy, the air is thunderous and I should not wonder if to-morrow the storm-steeds roar again deep-mouthed on this shore, a rampant and ravening tumult of waters.

Lady. I love thus to see the ocean beating the strong passion of its mighty heart against the stern, dumb, shore. How transitory is man in face of the intransient sea!

Professor. Man the "ephemeral, the creature of a day," as Æschylus called him!

Lady. Multitudinous are the moods of the sea—like a woman's.

Barrister. And a woman's as a cat's, at one time gentle and purring, at another ready to run up the wall and fly at your throat.

Professor. Not cat-like, butameleon-like I should call the sea.

The lady turned to the speaker and bowed silent but sarcastic thanks; then said:

Lady. How beautifully Tennyson has written of the sea! Not a single point of view from which he has not limned it. And so original!

Professor. Of that I am not quite sure. To me, he never awakened to the glamor and magic of the sea. And all the stranger because the sea has so formative an influence on the character; yet born and bred by the sea he never once, *ex professo*, described it. And this though he was poet laureate and England owes her all to the sea!

Barrister. "All?" That would be a mere extrinsic advantage. But don't you think the English race displays an intrinsic superiority over every other?

Professor. No doubt it would be gratifying to hold that view. But the proofs? Are Englishmen more enduring than Frenchmen, more energetic than Germans, more artistic than Italians, more enterprising or more inventive than Americans? Do employers of labor think so? The Englishman's merit is due to the favoritism of his position. The sea gives him the title-deeds of empire. Yet the deeper sea-meanings never dawned on Tennyson: At any rate they

never inspired him to anything above word-painting. And many sea-aspects escaped him altogether.

Barrister. For instance, the sea's present mood of low-lipping placidity?

Professor. Yes, it is calm as a cradled child.

Lady. Yet Tennyson gives you "the placid ocean-plains;" and "waves that sway themselves in rest;" and "as thunder-drops fall on a sleeping sea."

Barrister. Well, that is meagre enough. Nor is he a spendthrift in names for the sea. I can recall but three—"brine, deep, flood."

"The rolling *brine* that breaks the coast."
"From the great *deep* to the great deep he goes."
"The fallow *flood*."

And none of these, I think, is original?

Lady. The epithet "fallow" at least is original.

Professor. Nay, is it not Homer's "unharvested?"

Lady. In his descriptions of the sea's action he is richer; for example, its action on the beach:

"When the crisp slope waves,
"After a tempest, rib and fret
"The broad imbasèd beach."

Or, again, he speaks of England's rocks that

"Shatter, when the storms are black
"In many a streaming torrent back,
"The seas that shock thy base."

Professor. And how dainty the line:

"Waves on a diamond shingle dash!"

Barrister. And this is sonorous:

"The tide in its broad-flung ship-wrecking roar."

Lady. But in this, listen to the sound fitted to sense:

"The scream of a maddened beach dragged down by the waves."

Professor. Yet the beauty, polished but over-elaborated, is that of sound rather than of sense; words rather than ideas.

Lady (abruptly). How deftly Tennyson paints the sea's action on a boat:

"The pleasure-boat that rocked
"Light green with its own shadow, keel to keel,
"Upon the dappled dimplings of the wave
"Which blanched upon its side."

Professor. A dainty conceit, but not original. "Dimplings" is of course Æschylean:

"The many-dimpling smile of ocean-waves."

II.

Here the conversation halted for a while. The lady was waxing

eager, nettled perhaps at the Professor's antagonism. But was he in earnest? For about the corners of his grave mouth there flickered the shadow of a smile, as though he were toying with his friend's enthusiasm.

But the evening breeze was already born and began to ruffle the sea-plain. Then the conversation began anew.

Barrister. How instantaneous the response of water to wind! Tennyson has some pretty things about the interaction of winds and waves.

Professor. "The winds leaning upon the ridged sea."

Lady. Yes, and of the dominance of water by wind:

"Ye could not hear the waters for the blast,
"Tho' heapt in mounds and ridges all the sea."

Professor. And how splendid is this onomatopaea:

"The white cold heavy-plunging foam, whirled by the wind."

III.

At this moment a school of porpoises rolled by, within easy distance of the shore, "wallowing unwieldy, enormous in their gait." To them what did the sea look like, viewed from those nether depths? And I ventured to ask my Tennysonian experts whether or not our poet had any thoughts on the subject.

Barrister.

"As the drowning seaman hears,
"Who, with his head below the surface dropt,
"Listens the muffled booming indistinct
"Of the confused floods, and dimly knows
"His head shall rise no more."

But "listens" for "hears" is harsh.

Lady. At any rate, Mr. Barrister, this is not harsh:

"Below the thunders of the upper deep,
"Far, far beneath in the abysmal sea
"The kraken sleepeth. . . .
"There he will lie
"Until the latter fire shall heat the deep."

What a majestic thought you have there, that when the crack of doom peals through the universe, the fiery finger-tip of the Great Judge shall turn the ocean into vapor, to roll vast volumes around the Eternal Throne!

Professor (clapping his hands). Bravo! But is all that in Tennyson?

IV.

The lady affected not to hear this disparaging query. But by this time the wind had freshened and the waves began to roll in more

noisily, and to weave their changing fringe of silver foam against the pebble-paven shore.

Lady. What a wealth of epithets Tennyson has coined for such a sea!

Barrister. "The *crisp slope* waves."

Professor. "The *trenched* waters run from sky to sky."

Barrister. "Under the *hollow-hung* ocean green."

Professor. "The *mounting* wave will roll us shoreward soon."

Lady. "The *wrinkled* sea beneath him crawls."

Professor. It was from another standpoint that Byron was thinking of the "wrinkled" sea, when he wrote so nobly:

"Time writes no wrinkle on thine azure brow."

Barrister. To Tennyson, the sea is "wrinkled," I suppose, because seen from an elevation; to Byron, because it never grows old?

Professor. Yes, because it is immortal. This latter and larger view Tennyson overlooked. Ocean's undying youth he did not, like Wordsworth, realize:

"Though inland far we be,"
"Our souls have sight of that *immortal* sea."

Barrister. And because "immortal," therefore "unchangeable"—as Byron has it and Tennyson has it not.

"*Unchangeable*, save to thy wild waves play."

Professor. And because "immortal" and "unchangeable," therefore a mirror of the Infinite, as Chenedolle remembers, but Tennyson forgets:

"Sea! Of Almighty itself the immense
"And glorious mirror! How thine azure face
"Renews the heavens in their magnificence,
"And God's throne rests on thy majestic deeps."

Lady (petulantly). May I finish my catalogue of Tennysonian sea-epithets?

"Sweet and low, sweet and low,
"Over the *rolling* waters go."

And again:

"The dread sweep of the *down-streaming* seas."

Barrister. Fine, indeed! Here is another:

"The *league-long* roiter *thundering* on the reef."

Lady. Superb! And this?

"A sudden blast blew us thro' a *boundless* sea."

Professor. "Boundless" is a Greek epithet. To us moderns the idea is one of awe and magnificence; but to those old world Greeks, of the formless, inartistic, terrible, hateful!

V.

For a little space we mused in silence, to take in the fair picture. Then a wave, broader-backed than its fellows, rolled in majestically, broke noisily, clamored among the shingle, rushed white up to our feet, lingered a moment, and then fingered its way back tremulously.

Lady. In Tennyson's soul what a sympathy there was with sea sounds! To the ocean's mighty diapason, to the rush and roar of organ winds and waves, to the tenderer melodies awakened by the sea-harper when he lays his hand on the shore as on a lyre, Tennyson's ear was most delicately attuned. For example,

"A silver cloud hung over the *sounding* seas."

Barrister. "The *hollower-bellowing* ocean."

Professor. Even the great tidal-wave he does not forget:

"The great wave that *echoes* round the world."

Lady. "The stormy surf *crashed* in the shingle."

Barrister. Here is a line that appeals to me:

"Rolled to starboard, rolled to larboard, when the surge is *seething* free."

The evening was now drawing on apace, the sun had sunk below the horizon, and from the roseate zenith the colors of the sky shaded down through opal, mingled with patches of saffron, to a sumptuous purple by the watery horizon. And we watched the changing hues of the sea which imaged the many-tinted sky, as a lover wears his mistress' colors on his breast.

Then I ventured to ask them what Tennyson's sea-colors might be. With ready memory they poured forth line after line.

Lady. "In the middle of the *green* salt sea."

Professor. "As *white* as ocean-foam in the morn."

Barrister. "White sails flying in the *yellow* sea."

Lady. "The *purple* seas hung in mid-heaven."

Barrister. "Like drops of blood in a *dark-grey* sea."

Lady. "The semi-circle of *dark-blue* waters."

Professor. Tennyson's "purple" is, I suppose, Homer's "por-phureos?"

Barrister. Yes, and "dark-blue" is Byronic:

"Roll on, thou deep and *dark-blue* ocean roll."

Professor. Tennyson's originality, at best, is only of form and not of thought. Homer could have furnished him with as many more color-epithets as there are colors in the rainbow; "murky," "livid," "ashen," "violet-tinted," "black," "grey," and "wine-tinted."

VI.

The lady looked irritated and I interposed with the remark that

Tennyson was a very mine of rich, and even original, phrases for sea-motion. And I offered the quotation :

"Where yon fair water sweetly, slowly *glides*."

Lady. Our poet gives us also, "the *sliding* tides;" "the *myriad-rolling* ocean;" "the *heaving* deep;" "the breaker *breaking* on the beach;" "rolling ridge on ridge."

Professor. Also, "the *forward-creeping* tides began to foam."

Barrister. And here is a good distich :

"*Slow-moving* as a wave against the wind,"
"That flings a mist behind it in the sun."

Lady. And these expressions—how apt !

Rippled, like an *ever-floeting* wave.

Professor. And these :

"When the tide"
"*Flashed*, sapping its worn ribs; and all without"
"*The slowly-riding* rollers on the cliffs"
"*Clashed*, calling to each other."

Barrister. "Upblown," too, is, I think, original?

"The waste and open sea"
"When the *up-blown* billow runs"
"Shoreward, beneath red clouds."

Professor. Does our poet give us "swirling surges?"

Lady. No, but its equivalent, "weltering waters."

Barrister. And listen to the muscular collectedness of this :

"The shock"
"*Of cataract* seas that snap"
"The three-decker's oaken spine."

Professor. I should be the last to question the poetic beauty of these expressions. But is it not beauty of sound only? There is a want of heart in it all. To me it is like a well-chiselled face through which the soul speaks not—clear-cut but cold—symmetrical but passionless—without savor or salt. Compare Tennyson's prettinesses with Shakespeare's regal magnificence :

"The cradle of the rude imperious surge."
"And in the visitation of the winds,"
"That take the ruffian billows by the top,"
"Curling their monstrous heads and hanging them"
"With deafening clamours in the slippery clouds."

VII.

Here I struck in to ask what the popular verdict might be on Tennyson's personifications of the sea, and I quoted one which then occurred to me :

"A storm never wakes on the *lonely* sea."

Barrister. "There came so loud a *calling* of the sea."

Lady. And this is still nobler:

"The *moanings* of the *homeless* sea."

Professor. Magnificent! A really brave line! Keats, however, conceived the thought before Tennyson:

"The surgy murmurs of the lonely sea."

And William Falconer has something similar:

"The tired ocean crawls along the beach"
"Sobbing a wordless sorrow to the moon."

Lady (impatiently). May I continue the Tennysonian personifications?

"As on a dull day, in an ocean cave,
"The *blind* wave *feeling* round his long sea-hall
"In silence."

And again:

"Where the *chafed* breakers of the outer sea"
"Sank powerless."

And again:

"Upon the sands"
"I drew her name, until anon"
"The *wanton* billow washed them over."

Barrister. How do you like this?

"The *voice* of the long sea-wave, as it swelled."

Professor. I should call it less striking than the line it imitates, in *Fancy in Nubibus*:

"Rise to the swelling of the voiceful sea."

VIII.

A wave, more voluminous than usual, rolled shorewards, and we watched it gather, and arch, and curl into whiteness; for one instant the advancing mass paused to gather new strength, next rushed to our feet, eddied for a moment amid the pebbles, then hurried murmuringly and as it were regretfully back, muttering its inarticulate, musical, unfathomable speech.

Lady. What a glorious musician the ocean is! And sea-harmonies are never twice the same. The chords change with the waters' moods—a grand diapason, ranging from the rhythmic dirges of this mild sea to the crashing orchestral fugue of the seething, roaring, bellowing tempest.

Barrister. Does Tennyson shine as a sea-minstrel?

Lady (quoting). "But the wave would make *music* above us afar."

Professor. That, I think, is Tennyson's only reference to the subject. I do not believe he had any ear for sea-symphonies. On other

subjects his verses are often anthem-toned, but ocean-harmonist he was not. He has nothing to equal this passage of Pollak's:

"Great Ocean, strongest of creation's sons,
"Unconquerable, unrepoused, untired,
"That rolls the wild, profound, eternal bass
"In nature's anthem and makes music such
"As pleased the ear of God."

These lines the speaker mouthed out in a deep, melodious voice that emphasized the sonorousness of the passage. Did Tennyson fall short of that standard? His lady-champion had well set forth his many beautiful sea-lines. But was the beauty one of form only and not of substance? Were they only daintily chiselled verses, not deep and pregnant thoughts? Only thin word-pictures, painfully polished, not sweeping visions of the fine-frenzied eye, glancing from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven? What shall we answer?

The lady shrugged her shoulders, was it at the evening chillness, or at the professor's pedantry, or at the barrister's stolidity, or at my neutrality? So we left Tennyson and his sea-thoughts, and wended our way homewards—to light, and warmth, and dinner, and music, and rest. But ere we retired for the night, we paused by an open window to watch the star-lit sea and to listen to the moody music of the fantastic waves that, melancholy at old-world memories, were sighing and sobbing so softly, yet so sadly. Ancient sea, we men are brief heirs to dusty death!

Then to the lady the professor handed her candle and, bowing profoundly, declared that only on that evening had it been given to him to appreciate, at his true worth, Tennyson the sea-artist. And so, good night!

CHARLES COUPE, S. J.

London, England.

DUELLING: ITS EARLY HISTORY.

Je dis chez les humains le jaloux point d'honneur
Du duel téméraire inspira la fureur.

(Villon-Poème de l'Am.)

RARELY does a writer rejoice that his subject has not the interest of actuality. Still when this subject is Duelling, he even gladly notices the fact that it belongs to the past—at least in the English-speaking world.¹ Indeed, though it is not to be found on Anglo-Saxon soil as a living species, yet fossilized specimens may

¹ At this moment there is but one group of countries, viz., the English-speaking lands, where Duelling is not merely scouted and put down by law, but actually ridiculed. (Mr. Percy Fitzgerald in *Chambers' Dictionary*, 1889, s. v. Duelling.)

be discovered not very deep below the surface, and in greater number still in older strata of social life. If Steinmetz is to be believed, "in no country, France excepted, has Duelling been more in vogue than in England and Ireland."² And in America, its bygone popularity is sufficiently borne witness to by the stories of bowie-knives as well as by the names of Aaron Burr and Alexander Hamilton, and of others, whose history will be found in Steinmetz³ and elsewhere. Duelling will always be surrounded by the attractive dimness of past times, whilst it gives occasion to some interesting historical and ethical problems.⁴

If one of our great-grandchildren, unfamiliar with the early nineteenth century society, came across the fact that in A. D. 1804, the Vice President of the United States killed the leader of the opposition, how surprised he would be at the circumstances surrounding the occurrence. Two men meet in warlike array, the one standing to the other in the position of insulting and insulted; and the mere fact of firing pistols at one another is supposed to wash away the stain and to restore the moral equilibrium between them. This moral phenomenon, taken separately and without supposing the practice of the Duel established, must strike a thoughtful reader as being uncommonly strange. How an injured man may consider it a sufficient reparation to fire at his offender only on condition of himself running the same risk, is enough to baffle anyone. In the words of the "plain fellow" of Steele, who had been abused by a gentleman and was then offered a duel: "This is fine doing, last night he sent me away cursedly out of humour, and this morning he fancies it would be a *satisfaction* to be run through the body."⁵

As no human proceeding is totally absurd, one feels attracted to seek for an explanation of such a prejudice in its environments; the fact that Duels were sometimes ended by one of the opponents craving for mercy and *acknowledging his wrong*, must raise a suspicion that Duelling may receive its explanation from without. Here as in many other instances, a custom in itself is unintelligible; it must be considered in its natural place in historical evolution. A difficulty at once suggests itself; as will be seen later, Duelling may be conceived under many different aspects. Old writers, who loved to

² Steinmetz, *The romance of duelling*, i., p. 6.

³ Loc. cit., vol. ii., pp. 298 foll.

⁴ The sad prevalence of Duelling in Germany and Austria at the present day need not be insisted upon. Interesting details about German duels will be found in an article published by Mr. Bachofen von Echt in the *Nineteenth Century* for April, 1903.

⁵ *The Tatler*, June 7, 1709.—Duelling "is not less absurd than if after a ruffian had violated my wife, or set fire to my house, I should consent to toss up, heads or tails, whether he should be hanged for it or I." (*Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. xxxi., pp. 57, 58.) ..

go deep into matters—in their search for “ultimate causes”—used to begin their treatises on Duelling with David and Goliath. On the same line, one might conceive a history of Motor-Cars tracing their origin to the first boy who set his top spinning; the whole question is a matter of words. But this is not the only difficulty; as many other customs, for instance Slavery, Duelling is the result of a very complex causality and it seems to us impossible to pick out any one practice, and to say: in this Duelling originated.

However, this origin of Duelling must be studied; first, because any history of Duelling must begin at the beginning; and then also, because Moralists—or rather Casuists—have busied themselves with its early developments. “It is lawful for man, in the natural state, to give or accept a challenge, if it is the only way of saving his honour or his goods” is one of the propositions condemned in the Constitution *Detestabilem* of Benedict XIV. (10 Nov. 1752).⁶ We are thus concerned in considering the practice at a time when neither Church nor State could interfere much with the private doings of people.

When one reads some of the many treatises which have been written on Duelling, one is often reminded of the clown’s answer: “Words are grown so false, I am loath to prove reason with them.” (Twelfth Night, iii., 1.) The only possible course is to hedge the notion of single combat into a strict definition. To this, of course, might be objected that such a treatment is “à priori” and arbitrary; Burke disliked it, and gave his reason: “When we define we seem in danger of circumscribing nature within the bounds of our own notions. . . . We are limited in our inquiry by the strict laws to which we have submitted at our setting out.” To which, however, Cicero would answer: “Let every study taken up by the mind begin with a definition, so as to make known what precisely is the subject in question.”⁷ Had this rule been followed, less time would have been wasted on some discussions, for instance concerning the origin of Feudalism or of Trial by Jury. On our subject we find the assertion that “the Duello . . . belongs to every age and country, uncivilized as well as civilized” (Chamber’s Dict.), and on the other hand, an author like Muzio excludes from his treatment of Duelling those combats in which there is “quistione delle moglieri.”⁸ In medio stat virtus: we shall be safe in taking as guide

⁶ Bullarium Bened. XIV., vol. x., p. 77. Quoted e. g. in Castelein. *Instit. Phil. Mor. and Socialis*, p. 236.

⁷ Burke on the Sublime and Beautiful. Introd. on Taste.

⁸ Omnis quae a ratione suscipitur de aliqua re institutio, debet a definitione proficiat, ut intelligatur quid sit id, de quo disputatur. (Cic. de Off., l. 1.)

⁹ Muzio Giustinopolitano. *Del Duello* (Vinegia, 1551), p. 8, where he defines a Duel “una battaglia fatto da corpo a corpo per pruova della verita.”

current usage "quem penes arbitrium est et jus et norma loquendi." Duelling then will here be considered as "a private fight between two persons, pre-arranged and fought with deadly weapons, usually in the presence of at least two witnesses called seconds, having for its object to decide a personal quarrel or to settle a point of honour."¹⁰

Thus the scope of this study does not include what Mr. Ashworth calls the "American duel, where the two parties draw lots and the loser is under a moral obligation to kill himself within a specified time."¹¹ Champions, who represent their armies are not termed duellists; no more are the Germans mentioned by Tacitus (Germ. X) who fought augural combats under the eyes of the two contending hosts. Lastly, Duelling in the strict sense can be applied neither to the sudden struggle between an assassin and his victim, defending his goods or his honour, nor to certain single combats of which more will be said later. Given then this definition, *when* did Duelling originate? As a widely spread institution and a codified custom, it may be said to have been established in the sixteenth century. Most authors endorse the statement of Hume, who speaking of the well-known "affaire d'honneur" between Charles V. and Francis I., adds: "This famous challenge . . . produced a considerable alteration in the manners of the age. The practice of challenges and duels, . . . began henceforth to prevail on the most trivial incidents."¹² But as in the case of many other practices, Duelling did not appear suddenly in the social organism. The frequent repetition of the same act, that makes up a custom, has its historical basis in previous isolated instances: long before the use of umbrellas could be called an English custom, Jonas Hanway had hoisted his "portable pent-house."

Historians have made it their business to find out the *earliest recorded example* of a single combat which answers to our notion of a Duel. Many point to the intended "rencontre" between Francis I. and Charles V., in 1527. Steinmetz says: "The history of modern Duelling, in the strict sense . . . seems to date from the year 1527." (The Romance of Duelling I., p. 23.) An earlier instance,

¹⁰ Oxford dictionary, s. v. Duel—"The modern Duel, a pre-arranged combat with deadly weapons, between two private persons, to settle a private quarrel." (Enc. Britt. s. v. Duel)—The "*Duell-Codex*" of German students defines a Duel, a "private combat, following recognized rules and conditions agreed upon, in presence of witnesses, with deadly weapons of the same kind." (*Nineteenth Century*, April, 1903, p. 681.)

¹¹ The so-called American Duel . . . is not recognized as a Duel (not being a battle) by any foreign code, except that of Austria . . . which makes it a penal offense." (Ashworth, Enc. Britt., new vol., s. v. duelling.)

¹² Hume, *History of England*, Henry VIII., 1527—"There appears to be little doubt that it was in Germany, that about the middle of the sixteenth century [Duelling] became established as an institution." (Ashworth, Enc. Britt., new vols., s. v. Duelling). See also *The History of Modern Europe*, iv., 210.

however, is given by Dr. Grupp: "A new kind of Duels came into use on the verge of the fourteenth and fifteenth century; . . . we find in the year 1425 the first trace of the modern Duel."¹³ The affair here alluded to is that between Philip, duke of Burgundy, and an English Prince, "the Good Duke Humphrey" of Gloucester. As is well known, Humphrey, when Protector of the realm in Bedford's absence, had married Jacqueline of Hainault. This brought about a quarrel with Philip, who upheld the claims of her first husband, John IV. of Brabant; in the course of "a hot correspondence," in which Philip had been accused of perfidy, he called Gloucester a liar, and "challenged [him] to a duel; . . . Humphrey accepted the proposal." But eventually he was forbidden to proceed by Bedford and Pope Martin V.¹⁴ Perhaps it is possible to adduce instances of Duelling earlier still than that just quoted. Indeed, in Professor Trail's *Social England* (II., p. 264) a single combat which took place on London Bridge, in 1390, between Sir D. Lindsay, first Earl of Crawford, and Lord Welles, is called a duel, but the account given of it in the *Dictionary of National Biography* does not allow us to suppose that the term should be taken in its strict sense.

At any rate, 1250 seems to have been the date of a single combat which is nothing short of a Duel in the strict sense. Such at least is the impression conveyed by the following extract from a Chronicle of William Bardin: "A. D. 1250, a deadly enmity having set in between" two lords, they "decided to be their own champions, and having secretly chosen two seconds, in their presence engaged in a Duel; both however having been wounded, they were separated and dismissed by their seconds."¹⁵ That this encounter perfectly answers to our modern notion of Duelling will be shown by referring it to the definition quoted above. Its private character distinguishes it from the then frequent Battle Trial, while the narrative of its circumstances might be taken for a newspaper's account of a German or French "affaire d'honneur."

Whatever be one's view about this or any other combat, Logic bids us pause a while before calling it the first example of a Duel;

¹³ In Wetzer & Welke's *Kirchenlexicon*, 2d ed., s. v. *Zweikampf*.

¹⁴ Prof. F. T. Tout, in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, s. v. Humphrey. Also *Kirchenlexicon*, loc. cit.

¹⁵ Anno Domini 1250, cum inimicitia capitalis intervenisset inter nobilem Gausselinum dominum de Lunello militem ex una parte, et nobilem Guillelmum de Bonvileo militem ex alia, . . . hi duo milites fieri voluerunt Camplones, et clam acceptis duobus patrinis, et in eorum praesentia, ad Duellum ventum est: et utroque vulnerato a patrinis separati et dimissi sunt. Chron. Guil. Bardini tom. 4 Hist. Occit. inter Probat. col 4. (Du Cange-Henschel *Glossarium* s. v. Duellum.) This chronicle, entitled *Historia chronologica parlamentorum patriae occitanae* is to be found in: *Histoire générale du Languedoc*, avec des notes et des pièces justificatives. Paris, 1742, vol. iv., col. 4.

this would involve the assertion that no similar proceeding ever took place before. Indeed, many a writer seems satisfied that this negative proposition is sufficiently established. It is generally assumed that "in the specialized sense which the word now bears, the Duel was a peculiar institution of comparatively recent origin, a local custom which never spread beyond the limits of civilized Europe."¹⁶ For reasons which will appear in the course of this paper, we beg to demur to this—as we think—too absolute statement. Evidently one is not justified in suspecting instances of a practice where there is no ground for doing so; a history of electric telegraphy may safely neglect classical antiquity and uncivilized countries; not so, we venture to believe, a history of Duelling. It is a study as interesting as it is useful to the historian of Duelling, to examine into those *practices of earlier times which suggest the existence of the duel*, not as a full-blown institution, it is true, but as a straggling and altogether inconspicuous growth among the tangle of ancient records. Obviously, in the *Middle-Ages*, the widespread custom of Trial by Battle—of which more anon—may often have prompted private individuals to be their own judges and settle their quarrel privately, as they might have done by order of a regular tribunal. It has been shown above, that mediæval chronicles yield at least one instance of such an occurrence; we are surprised not to find them more numerous. But it is well to remember that our information of those times is very scanty regarding all but those conspicuous in religion or politics, or whose history has been rescued from oblivion through their connection with the monasteries and their consequent mention in the convent records. The instances of single combats in the *Old Testament*, on which Mr. Storr remarks that "a vast amount of perverse ingenuity has been spent," do not seem to answer to our notion of a Duel. For instance, in Deut. xxv., 11, "If two men have words together, and one begin to fight against the other," "the allusion seems to be to a sudden and unorganized strife, rather than to a deliberate combat."¹⁷ No example of a private and prearranged encounter can be found in the Bible; but contrarily to what may be called the common opinion, *classical antiquity* is more instructive. If the Wager of Battle had been customary among the Greeks and Romans,¹⁸ we might, as in the *Middle-Ages*, expect to find indi-

¹⁶ Mr. Francis Storr (*Enc. Britt.*, s. v. *Duel*.)

¹⁷ QUARTERLY REVIEW, vol. 169, p. 189.

¹⁸ Bro. Azarias, in the AMERICAN CATH. QUART. REV. (vol. II., p. 395) speaking of Battle Trial, says: "Nor were the early Greeks and Romans without this means of determining guilt or innocence. Long after the practice had been abolished, the word in which it was expressed remained. With both peoples, the same word meant both to fight and to judge or determine. (Greek, *χρίναι*; Latin, *decernere*)." A fight between two *nations*, however, judges or determines the question between them. See the following note.

viduals taking the law into their own hands, but such does not seem to have been the case.¹⁹ Yet, though Battle Trial did not exist as a regular proceeding, it may be inferred from some passages that disputed questions were occasionally settled by the sword. Christianus Cilicius declares that "if any more severe dispute arose about rights or offices, esp. among nobles, taking Mars as judge, they settled their disputes by a Duel, according to the ancient custom of the Romans."²⁰ Whatever be the value of this and similar texts, an instance such as the following seems to deserve mention. The office of priest of a temple of Diana not far from Oretia was held by a Dane; but if a fugitive succeeded in plucking off a twig of a tree which stood in the temple, he could fight the priest in a single combat, which decided who should fill the post.²¹ More conducive to private duels must have been the gladiatorial *Monomachia*. Young rakes of high standing and noble birth, knights even in the time of Augustus, were satisfied to make money by hiring out their services, (*se auctorare*), for the displays of the Amphitheatre.²² Little wonder then if we find individuals agreeing to end a quarrel by a combat of this sort. A famous example of such a practice is that narrated by Livy (xxviii., 21) as having taken place at the funeral feasts celebrated by Scipio Africanus in honour of his father and his uncle. The *monomachia* which were held on this occasion were fought by young men of the army and of friendly tribes, who offered themselves, not indeed as hirelings like the spendthrifts of a later period, but either to do honour to the general, or to show off their skill, "some decided by the sword quarrels which they had been unable or *unwilling* to settle by argument, for they had agreed that the winner of the fight should secure the possession of the disputed object." Commenting on this episode, Selden writes: "It were too Arcadian-like to fetch hence or out of these times, the infancy or beginnings of the Duello-Trial by course judicial."²³ So be it, but we fail to see

¹⁹ "Quelques savants ont cru pouvoir affirmer que le duel judiciaire etait en usage chez quelques anciens peuples de la Grèce et de l'Italie; mais les textes sur lesquels ils s'appuient sont bien incertains, et leur opinion est loin d'être généralement adoptée." (*Les origines du duel judiciaire*, an article published by the Bollandist Father Ch. De Smedt, S. J., in *Etudes*, vol. 63, p. 338, 339, where he refers to Fr. Patetta, *Le Ordalie*, chap. v.

²⁰ Quoted in Olans Wormius *Mon. Dan.*, i. 1., c. 10. See also Nicolaus Damascenus: "Umbrici, cum controversias invicem habent, arma sumunt, et tamquam aperto Marte congrediuntur, et putantur justiora dicere, qui adversarium occidunt" (quoted in Canciani *Barbarorum L. L. Ant.*, vol. iv., p. 6.)

²¹ See Servius (Daniellus) . . . *ad Aeneid* vi., vs. 136, quoted together with several others in S. Pelloutier, *Histoire des Celtes* (La Haye 1750), vol. 1., p. 436, 437 note.

²² Several references to this practice will be found in J. Lipsius, *Saturnum Sermonum libri ii. qui de Gladiatoribus* (Antwerplae, 1588) p. 29.

²³ *The Duello or Single Combat*, ch. v., quoted in the *QUARTERLY REVIEW*, vol. 169, p. 160.

how combats of this sort fall short of our modern notion of a duel; unless it be said that they were not private because fought under the eyes of the whole army, and that an encounter *freely pre-arranged* between two English officers in Georgian times could not be called a duel if it had taken place in public.²⁴ At all events, such instances as are found among the Romans are extremely rare, and cannot be said to constitute a custom.²⁵

Leaving classical antiquity we find single combats practiced among several *barbaric peoples prior to the Middle-Ages*. It has been pointed out already how easily a warlike people among which Judicial Combat was used must have been inclined to settle their private disputes by Duel. Now, it seems probable that from a very early date the tribes of the large German stock practised, if not Battle Trial as a regular and codified institution, at least that sort of rudimentary Wager of Battle which we shall find among the tribes of the Malay Archipelago. Father De Smedt indeed is of opinion that Judicial Combat was practised by the Germans only from the time of their conversion to Christianity.²⁶ But he evidently speaks of Battle Trial in the stricter sense. Velleius Paterculus narrates that the tribes who were to slaughter Q. Varrus and his legions (A. D. 9) lulled him into a false security by submitting to Roman procedure: they hypocritically "thanked him for settling their disputes in the Roman fashion . . . and for ending by law contentions which they formerly ended by the sword."²⁷ It may be asked, whether given the state of Germanic society which Tacitus describes not long after, this settling of private quarrels must be understood of the wild private war of the savage? Or if on the contrary we do not already detect here the first organization of the regular Battle Trial. Such

²⁴ "Questo non voglio tacer io, che sotto il nome del nostro Duello possono venire dirlittamente esempi di alcuna antica historia, . . . lequali sotto Scipione furone fatte in Hispagna ne' giuochi da lui fatti per le esequie del padre et del zio, dove per via di disfide si vene a diverse battaglie" (Muzio, op. cit., p. 9). Muzio's conception of the Duello, it may be noted, is applicable to some at least of the modern Duels.

²⁵ "Questo costume di combattere per querele particolari . . . sotto la Signoria de gli antichi Romani non era in alcuna consuetudine. Anzi per *differenza di honore* si lege appresso Cesare, che Puisio e Varenio si sfidarono a dover mostrare contra il nimiche gente il lor valore." (Muzio, op. cit., ibid.)

²⁶ "Un fait remarquable a relever . . . dans l'histoire de cette institution, c'est qu'elle n'apparaît que chez les nations de race germanique, et cela seulement depuis leur conversion au Christianisme." (Father De Smedt, loc. cit., p. 338.)

²⁷ "Simulantes fictas litium series, et nunc provocantes alter alterum injuria, nunc agentes gratias quod ea romana justitia finiret feritasque sua novitate incognita disciplinae mitesceret, et solita armis decerni jure terminarentur, in summam socordiam perduxere Quintillum." (Vell. Pat. Hist. Rom. II., 118.)

is the view expressed by Stiernhöök; speaking of the *cenwig*, or Gothic duels, in connection with the text just quoted, he says: "Velleius Paterculus mentions their use in Germany at the time of Cæsar Augustus;" he makes his opinion quite clear by stating: "Among these [means of discovering the truth] the Duel is the most ancient, dating almost from barbaric ages, and before the faith of Christ."²⁸ Here again the question whether these single combats may be called Duels or not is largely a question of words. The same must be said of similar instances found among the *Keltic population* of Western Europe. They also occasionally left the appointment to some offices to the chances of a single fight. Cæsar (de Bell. Gall. 6, 13) mentions that candidates for the office of High-Priest among the Druids "sometimes also contend for supremacy sword in hand." But combats of a more private character were a common occurrence. Father De Smedt, on the authority of M. d'Arbois de Jubainville, considers that the Keltic documents bear no trace of Judicial Combats, but testify to the frequency of conventional Duels.²⁹ The nature of these conflicts was as follows: "If the warriors quarrelled about their helping of food, or any matter of precedence they would get up and fight the question out to the death; and in more ancient times, the strongest man would seize the joint and *defy the company to mortal combat*. If no duel occurred during the meal, the guests were entertained with a sword play, or sometimes a man would die to amuse the rest."³⁰ That the *Bretons of Wales* also had some sort of Duel—called Ornest or Ymornest—is D. Wilkins' opinion.³¹ Lastly, if the testimony of Herodotus is to be trusted on this point, we find Duelling practised by another branch of the Indo-European family; the *Scythians*, he says, transform into drinking-cups "the skulls of their own kith and kin, if they have been at feud with them, and have vanquished them *in the presence of the King*."³² This last detail seems to authorize us to suspect

²⁸ Joh. O. Stiernhöök. *De Jure Sveconum et Gothorum vetusto libri duo* (Holmiae, 1672), p. 74. This theory is corroborated by the remarks which may be found in Canciani, loc. cit., vol. iv., pp. 5, 6.

²⁹ Father De Smedt, loc. cit., p. 338 note.

³⁰ Mr. Charles Elton, *Origins of English history*, p. 123, where the authorities will be found—Posidonius, apud Athenaeum, *Deipnosophist*, iv., 13 (Schweighæuser, ii., p. 100): "Adpositis in coena pernis, quicumque fortissimus esset femur acciperet: sin alius id sibi vindicaret, singuli certamine congressi ad mortem depugnabant." See also *Origines Celticae*, by Mr. Edwin Guest, ii., p. 98.

³¹ In Canciani, op. cit., vol. iv., p. 426, c. 1: "Cambro-Britanni tamen vocem *ornest* habent pro duello, sive monomachia perinde et si Britannis olim in usu. Vid. *Dictionn. Britann. Lat.* in voce Ornest et Ymornest." But the origin of the word seems doubtful. See Lye-Manning, *Dictionn. Laonico et Gothico Latium*, s. v. Orrest.

³² Herodotus, iv., 65; transl. of Prof. Geo. Rawlinson, iii., p. 54.

a more or less formal proceeding. To conclude with an extract against the opinion that Duelling is unknown in uncivilized countries, a very interesting custom may be mentioned here, which was in vogue among the *Maoris of New Zealand*, in case a man was convicted of adultery. The nature of the case seems to excuse a rather lengthy quotation. "When the paramour was a free man, the regular mode of proceeding was for the husband to go armed with a light spear, accompanied by several friends, to the offender's residence; who having had notice of his coming, awaited him similarly supported and armed. It was then decided *whether satisfaction or compensation* was to be given. If the former, the husband commenced the attack by rushing at the paramour's breast with his spear, who received the thrust in a position between sitting and standing, holding an erect spear in front by both hands, prepared to ward off the thrust. If this is parried the injured husband thrusts again and again. After the third thrust, the debt is paid, the paramour springs on his feet, and *both fight on even terms*. The first wound, if slight, ends the combat, if *mortal*, some relative seeks satisfaction: a general quarrel ensues, ceasing only when one party is beaten."³³

Such then are some of the *isolated specimens* of the Duel, more or less strictly so called found either in the field of well ascertained history, or in the less known regions of remote ages or of distant races; possible data for a complete survey of this moral phenomenon, but which are *not sufficient to explain its origin as a social institution*. The single combats of earlier times herald and suggest our modern Duel, but they are not the immediate source from which it has been evolved.

Mr. Augustine Birrell likes "to see an author leap-frog into his subject over the back of a brother;" one might enter upon this question of the *origin of Duelling* by "showing up" Cyclopedias and Dictionaries. This, however, would not be doing them justice: limited to a narrow space, they are called upon to solve in three words an intricate problem. In questions of social manners, just as in etymological questions, it may be fairly easy to collect the recorded instances and even to arrange them in chronological order; but to detect and prove the causal connection between them, is a task which will often leave competent judges undecided. This difficulty, which must always puzzle evolutionists—ethical and otherwise—is especially embarrassing in the matter at hand. The great majority of writers, following Montesquieu (*Esprit des lois*, l. xxviii.), take it that our modern Duel is the natural offspring of the Mediæval

³³ *The Story of New Zealand*, by Arthur S. Thomson (vol. 1., pp. 178 foll). We shall have occasion, when speaking of Judicial Combat, to mention other similar practices of Malay tribes.

Wager of Battle.³⁴ Mr. Storr (Enc. Britt. s. v. Duel) draws a sharp line of distinction between the history of the two practices; alluding to the case of a certain Jacques Legris in 1385, he writes: "Henceforward the duel in France ceases to be an appeal to Heaven, and becomes merely a satisfaction of wounded honour." It cannot be doubted that the practice of settling judicial contests by the sword has had a considerable influence in bringing about our modern Duel. The State acknowledged single combat as a legal way of deciding whether a man had been justly or wrongly insulted. It being understood that God helped the righteous against his wicked opponent, just as a mutual claim on a portion of land was settled by "Battel," so also were decided what we call affairs of honor. From the perusal of the old Teutonic laws, it seems that insults were punished only in case they proved to be without foundation;³⁵ naturally then, if, for instance, a Lombard had been called *arga*, the law allowed him to show by the Duel that the insult was ill-founded.³⁶ A passage of the law of Gothic Upland—the classical passage in the matter—is still more suggestive: "If a man say to a man an ignominious word: Thou art not a man worthy of the name, or Thou art not of a manly heart—I am (says the other) a man as well as you; these two shall meet at the crossing of three roads."³⁷ So it is that we find early writers on Duelling considering it as essentially a means of proving an assertion.³⁸ Indeed Gorville contends that modern Duelling owes its origin chiefly to the superstitious character of the Wager of Battle; because, he says, but for the belief in a supernatural intervention, which supposes no advantages on either side, how can be explained the reason why the opponents are made to fight on *equal* terms. (*Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. xxxi., p. 59.)

At the same time, the assertion that Duelling originated in Battle Trial again implies a question of definition. In a sense, and how-

³⁴ See, for instance, among more recent authorities, the *QUARTERLY REVIEW*, vol. 169, p. 198; the *Edinburgh Review*, vol. lxxv., p. 423: "These laws and customs [of the Gothic Battle Trials] are the true sources of the duel." Steinmetz takes exception: "The modern practice of Duelling cannot be traced to those national institutions of old [Battle Trial]." *The Romance of Duelling*, 1., 23.

³⁵ For instance, *Lex Salica Ant.*, tit. 67, 2. "Si quis mulierem ingenuam striam clamaverit, aut meretricem, et convincere non poterit . . ." See following note.

³⁶ "Si quis alium Argam per furorem clamaverit . . . et si perseveraverit et dixerit, se posse probare per pugnam, convincat eum, si potuerit." *Leges Rotharis*, 384. (Canciani, op. cit. i., p. 97, c. 1.)

³⁷ "Si dicat vir viro probrosum verbum: non es vir viri compar, aut virili pectore: ego vero sum vir (inquit alter) qualis tu. Hi in trivio conveniunt." (J. O. Stiernhöök, loc. cit., p. 77.)

³⁸ See above the definition of Muzio; on p. 74 he speaks of the vanquished as "non havendo probato quanto dovea provare."

ever paradoxical this may seem, Duelling might be said not to have sprung from, but to have produced *Judicial Combat*. Very early instances of Duels have been mentioned above, which, though intended to settle a disputed question, would not be considered Trials by Battle, for they were neither *legally recognized* nor supposed to decide a question of *right*. The opinion of Father De Smedt has been quoted; another writer, speaking of the ancient Scandinavian combats, says: "It is scarcely proper to give the name of judicial battle to such conflicts, to which, as in modern duel, the parties were incited, because no award of a judge could either redeem their honour or allay their feelings."³⁹ Perhaps also the view put forward by Stiernhöök tends to the same conclusion; he holds that in the old Scandinavia Duels were originally fought, not so much to settle a doubtful point, as to avenge insults and accusations of unmanliness and cowardice; later only was their use extended to other charges.⁴⁰ In connection with this theory, the following instance from an old Irish history is very suggestive: "On the appearance of the invading host [of Ailill and Medbh], Cuchulainn confronted them, and claiming the observance of the *strict laws of ancient Gaedhlic Chivalry*, demanded single combat, insisting that the invaders should not intrude farther into his territory until the victory of their champion and his own defeat should *justify their progress*." (E. O'Curry. *On the Manners and Customs of the Ancient Irish* II., 303.) At any rate, from the influence of Battle Trial in bringing about Duelling should not be drawn the conclusion sometimes arrived at, that the practice is unknown *outside the pale of the extended Teutonic influence*. The Maori duels have been alluded to; other instances of Judicial Combats in a larger sense are to be found among the *savages of the Malay Archipelago*, who settle their lawsuits, either by Battle, or by some less murderous physical contest. In Borneo, it happens that plaintiff and defendant, protected by a wooden cuirass, fight with lances; the first wounded loses the case; similar proceedings prevail in the primitive courts of Sumatra and of other isles.⁴¹

³⁹ *Edinburgh Review*, vol. 34, pp. 196 foll.

⁴⁰ "Apud nos antiquissimis temporibus magis ad contumelias et exprobra-tiones imbelliae et ignaviae vindicandas directa fuerunt [duella], quam ad res dubias explicandas, ut patet ex lege quae extat ad finem juris Uplandici in hunc modum." Here follows the Gothic text and the Latin translation quoted above. "Talis antiquissima lex: postea verisimile est (nam nullae manifestae nobis de eo leges) ad causas promiscue omnes duella fuisse admissa" (op. cit., pp. 76, 77). Compare *Edinburgh Review*, vol. lxxx., p. 229: "Among the nations of Gothic descent, the trial by ordeal originated in the custom to which it soon returned, that of private duels."

⁴¹ Dr. A. H. Post, in *Das Ausland*, Wochenschrift für Erd- und Völkerkunde, 1891, p. 85 foll; quoted in *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, 1891, i., 490. An Arabian maxim quoted by Barrington (*Observations on the Statutes*, p. 547) alludes to single combats, but of what kind? "Challenge no man to fight a duel; but, if thou art challenged, thou must answer. If he that challenges be unjust, and thou just, there are hopes, through God's mercy, thou shall gain the victory." (Translation of Aleh's Aphorisms, by Wild.)

The Wager of Battle, as it was in the mediæval society, certainly contributed much to introduce the modern duel. But it must not be represented as its only source: a stream flowing from a lake may either be only an overflow of the latter, or it may simply run through it, and have risen higher up on the mountain; that Duelling was evolved into Battle Trial, and then received itself a fresh energy from the universality of its new form, is a theory which might be defended. But certainly other streams came to swell the custom which the mediæval courts of justice poured on towards modern civilization; was the latter more or less important than its tributaries? Though this might seem to savor of historical skepticism, in a question of this nature the causal connection between facts is very hard to prove positively. Customs are indeed enumerated, which, given their character, allow us to surmise that they had more or less influence in bringing about Duelling; whether and in what degree they actually fostered it, must, we submit, be left sub judice. Who will decide if Feudalism owes more to the system of the *latifundia* than to recommendation or to the Germanic war-band? So also, has not the part played by Battle Trial in producing Duelling been *exaggerated to the detriment of that of Jousts and of Private War?*

To mention Jousts first, perhaps not enough stress has been laid on the character of some of the warlike pastimes of mediæval Knights; a closer study would explain Th. Buckle's view that Duelling originated in Chivalry.⁴² There is no need to dwell here at length on the very general custom of tilts and tournaments prevailing in the higher ranks of society from the twelfth century down to the sixteenth; the special sort of tilts which calls for our attention is the *Joust*, also called *Tabula rotunda*, or encounter between two combatants only. In most cases indeed, Knights and Squires would give and accept challenges only "for the love of their lady" or "to exalt their honoure;" but it is easy to see how such a widespread and highly esteemed practice must have encouraged the supposed vindication of honour by the Duel. Indeed we know how frequently chivalrous nobles would break lances to "show their prowess." Froissart, who admiringly relates many a deed of arms, tells of a Scottish Knight, Johan Ossueton (Seton?), who during the siege of Noyon, rode up to the barriers and challenged the French, wishing, he said, to *prove his "Knighthode" against theirs*.⁴³ Nor were these encount-

⁴² *History of Civilization in England*, i., 584. "Quod namque non monomachiam antiquorum, ut falso probare conati sunt qui hucusque duellum tractarunt, sed potius gladiatoriam duellum hujusce temporis referat, . . . hoc item attestari videtur, scilicet iisdem armis, atque eodem prope fine duellatores concertasse, quibus olim gladiatores pugnabant." Heronimus Mercurialis, *De Arte Gymnastica*, vi., 2. In J. Poleno's *Thesauri Antiquitatum supplementa*, iii., col. 704 B.

⁴³ Froissart's *Chroniques*. In the translation by John Bouchier, Lord Berners, (Reprinted London, 1812) vol. i., p. 417.

ers always mere harmless sport; Du Cange, in one of his Dissertations on Joinville distinguishes two kinds of tournaments: those of the first period, fought with blunt weapons, in which if accidents sometimes happened, it was against the intention of those who introduced this mock-fight; and the "*Armes à Oustrance*," or "*Justes mortall*" of later times, in which the opponents were armed "with sharpe heedes well fyled," sword, dagger or battle-axe. These contests "for life or death," he adds, differed from the Judicial Duel, in that they were not ordered by a lawful judge.⁴⁴ How easily these practices (which were sometimes copied by the lower class), could lend themselves to the satisfaction of public or private enmities, may well be imagined. It was shown in a memorable instance: in 1274, the English King Edward I., attended by his nobility, met in a tourney the Count of Châlons and the Burgundians; such was the animosity and the jealousy of the combatants, that several remained on the field, "so much so that the Châlons encounter was not called a tournament but a little war."⁴⁵ True it is, this fight cannot be called a duel; but examples are not rare of "*armes à oustrance*" fought by two champions only; the motive alone which prompted them seems to distinguish them from our modern Duel, which is supposed rather to restore honour than to bestow it. Yet, as might be expected, the mediæval Joust, once it was held to be the *test of valour*, came to be used as a means to wash away accusations of cowardice. Thus we find in Froissart's Chronicles the narrative of a Duel, in which Sir Peter Courtney, an English guest at the French court, was deadly wounded by the lord of Clary. On his return to Calais with the French Knight, who was charged to convey him, he stayed at the mansion of the Countess de Saint-Pol; speaking to her of his impressions on the "manner of Fraunce," he complained bitterly that he had been unable to accomplish any feat of arms; "wherefore, madame, he added, I saye and wyll say wheresoever I be come, that I coulede fynde none to do armes with me, and that was not in my defaute, but in the Knyghtes of Fraunce. The lorde of Clary noted well his wordes, and helde his pease with great payne;" but "whan they came near to Calais, . . . in the Kyng of Englandes lande," the Frenchman reminded Sir Peter Courtney of the words spoken "in ye Countesse of Saynt Poules chamber . . . : ye spake there over largely, to the great preiudyce and blame of the Knyghtes of Fraunce; . . . by ye whiche wordes may be understande that there is no Knyght in Fraunce that dare do

⁴⁴ Du Cange, *Dissertationes sur l'histoire de St. Louis*, Diss. vii. In the *Glossarium* (Du Cange-Henschel) vol. vii., p. 29 of the Dissert.

⁴⁵ Henry Knighton, *De Event. Angl.*, l. ii., p. 2459, quoted in Du Cagne, loc. cit., p. 26, who refers also to Matthieu Paris, anno 1241: "*Invidia multorum ludum in proellum commutavit.*"

armes . . . with you." In conclusion, as "one of the Knyghtes of Fraunce," he *challenges the Englishman to Justes mortall*; the proposal having been accepted, "he made his provisyon as shortly as he myght, for he wolde natte that over many shulde have knowen thereof." The result was that "the lorde of Clary strake the Englyssche Knyght throughe the tarze and throughe the shulder a hand-full," and was himself cast into prison by the King of France, for having "brought to the ieopardye of dethe . . . a straunge Knyght under the Kynges savegarde."⁴⁶ So, a sport originally harmless and justified by the necessities of war, came to be the occasion of mortal combats, and our modern Duel certainly owes much to this incarnation of the warlike mediæval spirit.

Another manifestation of this spirit was the state of almost continuous hostilities prevailing among the petty feudal lords; and Duelling may also have found here a powerful incitement. "In Gaul, it would have been impossible to deny the right of war and peace to the great vassals of the crown, . . . and if the vassals of the crown might make war on each other, on what principle could the same right be refused to their vassals? . . . Among the endless links of the feudal chain, it was hard to find the exact point where sovereignty ended and simple property began."⁴⁷ Hence the sense of his own right to settle disputes by the sword given to each one of these diminutive sovereigns. Now, war in the Middle-Ages was not always of the nature of a disorderly scramble; it took sometimes the shape of *huge Duels* fought indeed by several hundred combatants, but *at a time and on a spot agreed upon* beforehand. This may be shown by a few instances of particular interest. In the year 1279, Peter of Arragon and Charles of Angers "agreed to make war in the following manner: they should meet for the combat in the plain of Bordeaux, having each of them a hundred men; . . . a hundred against a hundred, among whom themselves, Charles and Peter, should be numbered, on the first day of June; and he who should be vanquished, or should not be forthcoming on that day, *should be disgraced forever*, deprived of the royal honour and name, . . . and should content himself with only one servant."⁴⁸ Another example is that of two lords of lower standing: in the year 1017, took place "the deadly encounter between Duke Godfrey and Count Gerard. For, having long been at variance, they agreed *on a certain day*, on which, attended by their followers, they should decide their quarrel by certain judgment of a duel. In the month of

⁴⁶ Froissart's *Chroniques*, l. 4, c. 6. We quote from Lord Berners' translation (op. cit.) vol. II., pp. 443-447. This encounter naturally suggests a comparison with the many duels fought by French soldiers during the occupation of Paris by the Allies.

⁴⁷ Prof. Freeman, *The Norman Conquest*, II., 238.

⁴⁸ *Annales H. Steronis Altah.* Freher-Struvius, *Rerum Germ. Script.* I., p. 566.

August . . . the combat took place *on the appointed spot*, the level ground of a blooming meadow."⁴⁹ When one notices such proceedings, remembering at the same time how the supreme prerogative of peace and war was scattered over the inferior detainers of feudal lordship, one cannot help feeling that they must have strongly contributed in bringing about the practice of Duelling. At a time when central authority was unable to call the private disputes of lords before its tribunal, the exercise of the usurped right of Private War must have taught the nobility to take into their own hands the avenging of the wrong they had suffered; hence the prejudice, so fatal in a later period, that some grievances cannot be settled by law, but that the parties must "fight it out."

By way of summing up the conclusions of this study, an answer may here be proposed to a double question. First, what was *the origin of Duelling*? Among the complex causes that went to introduce the practice, a double line of descent is traceable, one of play, the other of war. On the one hand, the Jousts of the Middle-Ages, which, like the modern student duels (*Mensuren*) of German Universities, acted as a training for and an encouragement to real duels; and on the other, the principle of private revenge, either in its raw native form, or codified and ennobled by superstition under the name of Battle Trial. As often happens in tracing the development of institutions, we notice that these two roots of Duelling strike deep in the history of peoples. Mediæval Jousts were at first only a renewal of the sham-fights or of the exercises practised by Greek and Roman soldiers, as well as by the youths of Germanic tribes (*Tacitus Germ. XIII.*)⁵⁰ Private War, as we observe it in Feudalism at its height, takes us back to the most primitive stages of civilization. When, for want of ethical knowledge, or of a powerful arbiter, conflicting rights cannot be settled, recourse is had to physical force. So, private revenge is found to be a custom of the ancient Jewish people, as well as of "the ancient Greeks, Germans and Slavs, some North American tribes, the modern Sicilians, Corsicans and Arabs."⁵¹ In the Middle-Ages, it was practised on a larger scale and sometimes with pre-arrangement, thanks to the proximity of other causes of Duelling; but it was only the renewal of a custom of earlier times. Concurrently with Private War, another factor, Bat-

⁴⁹ "Adflictiā mortiferū Godefridi Duclis et Gerardi Comitīs Congressum. Illi namque, diu invicem discordes, certum condixere diem, qua cum suis fautoribus hæc certo duelli iudicio discernent. Mense Augusto, . . . in quadam prati florentis planicie conducta confligebant." *Ex Chronico Ditmari episc. Merseburg. Historiens des Gaules*, vol. x., p. 135 E.

⁵⁰ See *Kirchenlexicon*, loc. cit. Hieronymus Mercurialls, loc. cit.

⁵¹ Prof. J. D. Prince in the *Jewish Encyclopedia* (New York, 1902) s. v. *Avenger of blood*.

tle Trial, has been shown to have influenced the growth of Duelling; but Battle Trial in its origin is only a derived form of Private War, which was gradually evolved and rose to the dignity of judicial proceeding. It was born from the efforts of elementary states, which, unable to force their arbitrament on "self-governing" individuals, hedged in the practice of blood feuds by calling them to their tribunal; authorizing and even prescribing the Battle in certain definite cases, these new-born administrations raised it to the dignity of an institution, to which superstition added an awful meaning and the majesty of a religious transaction.⁵² Thus it is under quite a new shape that we have seen this sort of single combat contributing to the spread of Duelling; for all that, it can be recognized as originally branching off from the rough trunk of Private War.

The far reaching character of these more immediate causes of Duelling leads naturally to our second question: What is the area of social life over which Duelling extends? Or *in what stages of civilization* is the practice to be detected? The reader must be left to judge if the instances of single combats in the embryonic state of civilization, whether among the inhabitants of Ancient Europe, or among the savages of Oceania may be termed Duels; and consequently how far ethics must be called a *practical* science when it treats of Duelling in the state of nature.

Whatever be the answer to this particular point, in a time when most doctrinal and ethical questions are considered in their historical development, this study of the early growth of a social disease is a natural and necessary basis for its treatment from an ethical standpoint.

L. WILLAERT, S. J.

Stoneyhurst, England.

SOME OF THE ADVANTAGES OF THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY.

THE question of making the Catholic University the centre of our entire school system will be discussed in this Essay.

The experiment would awaken more than ordinary interest. There is nothing novel in the idea: it is simply the application of the principle of unification to our Catholic school system. If successful, new life would be infused into our educational institutions, and the success of the University would be assured. The mediæval universities tested the idea and found it helpful. It is in successful operation now in the Catholic Universities of Louvain, Friburg and

⁵² See Father De Smedt, *op. cit.*

Lille and Laval where Catholic schools and colleges are affiliated. The idea prevails also among non-Catholic universities. London University is a good example: she is the mother of "University extension" in its various forms, which reverses the idea of university life. The University of France illustrates the possibility of having one central institution to dominate and stimulate our entire Catholic school system. Nearer home, we have a better illustration of what I mean: viz., the University of the state of New York. It has been in operation for upwards of one hundred years, and though in the beginning a rude machine, it has been brought to a wonderful degree of perfection. All its activities are for intellectual life. Its duties are chiefly of a supervisory nature. It is composed of five hundred incorporated institutions scattered throughout the state. It is directed by a body of men chosen from among the foremost citizens of the community. Each college or academy has its own charter and it has no interference whatever, except in stimulating, harmonizing and encouraging pupils and teachers to secure the very best results possible. Now this is just what we need for our Catholic school system. Why cannot our Catholic University do this work? We are assured that this is the earnest wish of our glorious Pontiff, Leo XIII. Let us examine a few of the advantages of a Catholic University.

I.

In the first place we might ask the question, why the Holy See, through its present illustrious head, Pope Leo XIII., recommended to the American hierarchy the establishment of a Catholic University at Washington. Was it for the sake of the advancement of the sciences, or for the benefit of the Catholic youth of these United States? The answer is clear. The Catholic University was recommended solely for the sake of our Catholic youth. The Church encourages and patronizes the arts and sciences for the sake of religion. She rejoices in the widest and most perfect system of education from an intimate conviction that truth is her ally as it is her profession, and that knowledge and reason are the handmaids of religion.

From this it is evident that the chief object of the Holy See in establishing our Catholic University at Washington was the moral and intellectual development of our Catholic youth, with a view to their spiritual welfare and their religious influence, so that they might fill their respective places in life better by making them more intelligent members of society. It was not therefore simply to develop professional skill in science and literature, that the University was founded, but to benefit the Catholic youth of these

United States. Consequently, it is not an institution merely to stimulate philosophical inquiry or to extend the boundaries of knowledge. All this is excellent, but there are numerous other institutions adapted for that purpose. It is a singular fact that very few of the great discoveries were made in universities. Of course there are noteworthy exceptions. The object, then, of a Catholic University at Washington is not simply to protect the interests of science and literature, but to make its students cultured Catholics and intelligent citizens of the United States. It does not seem rash to say that we Catholics are as anxious as our non-Catholic neighbors to have the advantages of a university education. We would consider it prejudicial to the interests of religion that our children should be less cultured and educated than others. At a great sacrifice we build and support our own schools and we are willing to apply the same principle as regards higher education. We all realize that without this latter we are handicapped. The Protestant youths of the country who have the means and inclination continue their studies till the age of twenty-two or twenty-three, and thus they employ, in serious studies, the time of life most important and most favorable to mental culture. Most of our Catholic youths end their education at sixteen or seventeen, and consequently, in the great struggle for place and advancement, they cannot be considered a match for youths who end their studies three or four years later in life. This explains why so few of our Catholic laity are holding the highest places in the various walks of life. They are handicapped for the want of a university education. The consequences are that Catholics who aspired to be on a level with Protestants in discipline and refinement of intellect in the past, were obliged to have recourse to Protestant universities to obtain what they could not find at home. This is one of the many reasons why we should glory in the blessings of a Catholic University, for it will afford the advantages of higher education in the best Catholic form.

We might ask, what are these advantages? They may be summed up in one sentence—the culture of the intellect. The most of the Catholics of these United States came here penniless, oppressed, and robbed of educational advantages. For centuries they had been deprived of any education necessary for the man of the world, the statesman, the professional man, or the cultured gentleman. Thank God, this moral disability is being removed. In founding a university, our desire is, not polished manners and elegant habits only: these can be acquired in various other ways, such as by frequenting good society, by travel, by cultivating a taste for home study and refinement, and by the grace and dignity of a well regulated Catholic mind. But the force, the steadiness, the comprehensiveness and the

versatility of intellect, the command over our own powers, the just estimate of things as they pass before us, requires, as a rule, much effort and the exercise of years.

This is real culture. It manifests itself in a polish of manners and speech which is beautiful in itself and pleasing to others. But it does more. It trains the mind and brings it into form, for the mind is like the body. Young people outgrow their form; their limbs have to be knit together and their system needs building up. They often mistake their youthful spirits and overtax their strength. This is a good picture of the condition of the mind. They have no principles laid down within them as a foundation for the intellect to build upon; they have no discriminating convictions, no grasp of consequences. And therefore they talk at random if they attempt any lengthy discourse. They fail to perceive things as they are.

What is more common than the sight of grown up men talking on all kinds of subjects in that flippant manner that evidences that they do not know what they are talking about. Such persons have no difficulty in contradicting themselves in successive sentences without being conscious of it. Others can never see the point, and find no difficulties in the most difficult subjects. Others are hopelessly obstinate and prejudiced and after having been driven from their opinions, return to them the next moment without even knowing why. Others are so intemperate that there is no greater calamity for a good cause than that they should take hold of it. This delineation of intellectual shortcomings is common to the world at large. It is an evil which is to be met with everywhere, and to which Catholics are not less exposed than the rest of mankind.

When the intellect has once been properly trained and formed so as to have a connected view of things, it will display its powers with more or less effect, according to the mental capacity of the individual. With most men it makes itself felt in the good sense, sobriety of thought, honesty, self-command and steadiness of view which characterize it. In some it will have developed habits of business and the power of influencing others. In others it will draw out the talent of philosophical speculation and lead the mind forward to eminence in this or that department. In all, it will be a faculty of entering with ease into any subject of thought, and of taking up with ease the study of any science or profession. All this, university training will do even when the mental formation is made after a model but partially true; for as far as effectiveness goes, even false views of things have more influence and inspire more respect than no views at all, and hence the infidel, the heretic and the fanatic are able to do much, while the Christian who has never realized the meaning of the truths which he holds, is unable to do much. He

will, no doubt, save his soul, but will do little to influence others. Now if consistency of view can add so much strength even to error, what may it not be expected to furnish to the influence of truth?

II.

To-day the Church, in every quarter of the globe, is strenuously striving to establish Catholic universities. The movement implies that there are essential elements omitted in the present systems of education which are under the patronage of the state. The Church is no novice on the question of education. She has had too long an experience not to know when to approve and when to censure. She taught the barbarian hordes how to read; she formed them into Christian nations; she built for them the mediæval universities. It was under her guidance that the great schools of Paris, Boulogne, Padua, Oxford, Cambridge and of all of Europe, attained their maturity and were crowned with that halo of glory that hangs around them even to the present day. And when these schools passed out of her hands and ceased to do her work, she begins anew and lays the foundations of similar institutions which generations to come will regard with the same reverence with which we, at the present, regard her past works. Those who know not her untiring patience and divine origin, think her old and decrepit, and look upon all such efforts as the fancies of a second childhood. They forget that the Church is never old; she is as young and vigorous to-day as she was in the morning of her creation, and will so continue till the end of time. She is the custodian of principles both of reason and revelation, and her principles are unchanging and unchangeable. With the progress of time, views and opinions and systems are born, become mature, and die, to be replaced by others; but with these she does not identify herself. When they are the outcome of the principles placed in her keeping, she fosters them; when they contradict those principles, she opposes them and holds it her duty to call the attention of all to what is of truth. Now as thought is ever active, so too it is ever developing, and in its onward march, it partakes of the distinct coloring of each successive age. The spirit of each period will scatter among the seeds of truth also the tares of error. To root up and suppress these tares is part of the Church's mission; and as they vary with each epoch, so will her means of destroying them vary. A doctrinal error is broached, and she holds an ecumenical council to define the truth opposed to that error. Some false principle threatens the faith and morals of her children, and she encourages religious organizations with a spirit and scope directly opposite. And so when education, under the direction of

the state, became dangerous, owing to the lack of religious instruction, she, at once, established her own schools on a religious basis. She knew that her efforts would be only partially successful unless she had control of education in its higher phases. Therefore her eagerness to see Catholic universities wherever Catholics are able to support them.

The functions of such a university are many and far reaching. Therein may the children of the Church be well grounded in the reasons for the faith that is in them; therein may they leisurely and effectively coördinate all her doctrines and note the points at which each touches the other and see their harmonious relations as a whole; therein they may learn to reconcile scientific truth with the teachings of revelation; therein may be rounded the minds of the professors and teachers intended for our elementary and secondary schools; and thus may its beneficial effects be felt in all classes of society. It will mould intellectual action; it will create new spirit; it will infuse new life into educated Catholics.

We must bear in mind, however, that a university is not the work of a day. It is only through difficulties that it can grow into greatness. It must have large and commodious buildings; it must pay eminent professors; it must gather together a good library; it must have scientific cabinets; it must possess a goodly store of chemical and philosophic apparatus. All this involves considerable expense. Then a university is an institution of slow growth. The nature of the studies pursued and the advanced age at which young men are prepared to pursue them, render the attendance comparatively small. At most they are few who have the leisure and means to fit themselves for a university training and pass through its complete curriculum. For this and other reasons, a university, in its beginning, is not a paying institution. It must be a burden upon any body of men starting it. Only after years of work, hard, earnest, sincere, and often thankless work, when its Alumni will be able to speak for it, and its necessity shall have imperceptibly grown upon the people, will it begin to stand upon its own basis. But first it must work out a name, position and a prestige for itself. These achieved, men will wonder how their ancestors could ever have gotten on without such an institution. All honor then to those generous souls who bear the burden and heat of the day, and in silence labor hard in laying the foundations of institutions, the success of which theirs it will not be the lot to catch a glimpse of.

It is now upwards of fifteen years since the hierarchy of these United States undertook to establish a Catholic University at Washington, D. C. They began, possessing nothing, but they soon found generous friends who fully appreciated their efforts. They

did not want to trust their children to the secular universities that abound in every state; the lack of religious training in them is a defect which cannot be made up by other advantages, no matter how numerous or important. Catholic faith cost too much to barter it away for a feed of intellectual husks, and Catholics were prepared to bear this additional expense. They remembered that their forefathers had abandoned titles, power, wealth, education and even life itself, rather than forfeit the least jot or tittle of that precious article, and they were willing to maintain a university in addition to the burden of a dual system of education. This is why they undertook to build a university and to equip it with a magnificent corps of professors that would shed lustre on older institutions. They placed at its head a man who was well qualified for the position, the Right Rev. John J. Keane, D. D., the present Archbishop of Dubuque, Ia. He brought to the great work a love for it and a zeal for its success, and a joy in fulfilling his onerous duties that will never be forgotten by his friends and admirers. He possessed the rare power of being eloquent and magnetic in the pulpit and on the platform. His appeals to raise funds to place the institution on a sound financial basis were wonderfully successful. His individual traits of character were such as to endear him in a remarkable degree to professors and pupils. His personal influence with non-Catholics was great. All embarrassment vanished before his gentleness and winning manners. But it were doing him an injustice to represent him as all sweetness and meekness. He could be also strong. Such was the first rector of the Catholic University. For nine years he held this difficult position with a full sense of the responsibility attached to it, a just appreciation of the great work expected of him, and a true estimate of the character and intellect of the American youth with whom he had to deal.

In addition to the regular classes in the various departments, he inaugurated a course of lectures for the people of Washington. He also started the "University Bulletin" with the object of educating young and old up to the spirit and workings of a university system that aimed at being in touch with every element in the American Church. He gathered around him a corps of able professors—some of them having an international reputation in their various departments, and all having the true spirit of up-to-date educators. For a time it seemed that the University started by His Eminence Cardinal James Gibbons and the American hierarchy, with the blessing of our illustrious Pontiff Leo XIII., was to take its place among the great Catholic universities of the world. But Bishop Keane resigned in 1897, after having made a noble effort to weather the storm that came so unexpectedly upon him.

The Right Rev. Thomas Conaty, D. D., was chosen by the Holy Father to fill the vacancy, and how faithfully, successfully and untiringly he labored for its success during the past six years is a matter known to all familiar with the history of the University. He was eminently qualified to succeed. Possessed of a native wit and cleverness, knowing the world thoroughly, happy in his dealings with men, he evidenced on many occasions rare tact and readiness. He is a man of many resources when there is a question of doing good; his zeal is boundless. He is endowed with great personal magnetism and is an able speaker. He is a leader in many of the movements of the day for the bettering of the masses. His views are broad, and he has the rare gift of being tolerant of opinion, when it differs from his own. He recently resigned, and has been appointed to fill the vacant See of Los Angeles, Cal. His many friends follow him with their best wishes.

The third rector, Right Rev. Mgr. D. J. O'Connell, D. D., has just been installed. He is no stranger to Americans. For the past twenty years he has been a resident of Italy, "the University of the world." He is familiar with advanced scholastic methods, having received distinguished honors during his university course at Rome. He was appointed president of the American College, which position he filled for a number of years. Ten years ago he retired from the presidency of the College and his retirement afforded him an opportunity to pursue private studies. All this time he lived in an atmosphere of culture and learning. A simple residence in Rome is, in itself, an education. Every foot of earth in it is sacred ground; historic traditions hover everywhere. The inexhaustible wealth of the Vatican Museum and Library would supply groundwork for literary and scientific investigation for the longest life. A man with such varied advantages for the cultivation of head and heart must exercise a permanent influence for good upon the young men who will come to this seat of learning. It is a source of gratification to know that he has been warmly welcomed to his new office by the hierarchy of the whole country. He brings a special loving appeal to the Catholics of the United States from our beloved Pontiff, Leo XIII., urging the clergy and laity to make one more great effort in placing the University on a firm basis.

III.

The Catholic University, though beginning under bright auspices, has not received the patronage and confidence it deserves. It may be that we are not educated up to a sense of its necessity. In this shortcoming we are not alone. Protestants, too, are not alive to the

necessity of university education in the higher sense of the term. They attend Yale, Harvard and Syracuse, etc., not for educational purposes only, but also for political and social influence. They make acquaintances and form associations while there, and these same associates they meet in after life, not as strangers, but as old friends. The result is they have not to struggle for years to get a recognition; they are pushed into place at once. No doubt this temporary advantage is one of the reasons that induce Catholic parents to withhold their patronage from their own University. But this advantage should be regarded as a mere trifle when weighed against the many superior educational advantages to be derived therefrom, especially that greatest of all—the strengthening of the faith of their children.

Indeed Protestants as well as Catholics should be interested in the Catholic University. It is destined to become an impregnable bulwark against the attacks of irreligion. Its professors should give the proper cues for the right understanding of the new departures of science in its relation with revealed religion. It is only in the study of principles that true philosophy is found, and for these we must look to Catholic teaching. Hegel and Herbert Spencer can never take the place of Aristotle and St. Thomas. It is only in scholastic philosophy that the truths and principles exist, by means of which modern sophistries may be successfully refuted. The Catholic University should be the citadel of defense to meet the modern modes of intellectual warfare on revealed truth. The great conflict to-day is between infidelity and Christianity.

These are the days when every lover of truth should put forth his whole strength in its defense. Whoever has a timely word to say, should say it in the best and the most forcible manner possible. The day of voluminous treatises is forever past. Men are too busy to spend time on labored folios. The short essay and the brilliant lecture are taking the place of the cumbersome compilation. Our opponents are alive to this fact. They monopolize most of the magazines and reviews within their reach. The ablest writers of the day are enlisted in the interest of every form of unbelief. Men living in such an atmosphere are soon perverted, for they find it easier to doubt and question than to prove and refute. We must look to the Catholic University at Washington and the Catholic universities of the world to establish counter currents to the irreligion of the day.

For this reason and many others that might be adduced, we all should unite in making the Catholic University the crown of our entire educational system. Its influence should be felt from the kindergarten in our primary schools, up through academies, institutes, colleges and seminaries. It might perform the special work

of the religious and secular universities that I have already mentioned and thus influence every Catholic educational institution in these United States. Then we would have a common source of direction and supervision. There need be no interference with the particular methods used by our great teaching orders, male and female. The University would encourage teachers and pupils all along the line. It would, in other words, be a great supervisory board for our entire educational system, with one aim and object, to secure the best results possible in every department. Thus it would stimulate teachers and pupils. We need some such stimulus. Our academies and colleges are doing good work, God bless them, but they need encouragement. Unification is the cry of the public schools in our Empire State, and why should it not form the battle cry of our Catholic school system? If the federation of our Catholic societies would prove a blessing, why not the federation of our entire school system? I fully realize the difficulties in the way, but there is a starting point for all such movements. Bishop Conaty sounded the correct note in the college conferences. This was a step in the right direction, but let it be broadened and extended not alone to college entrance and the equal value of diplomas representing academic honors, but let us also apply it to all text books necessary for the higher studies touching science and religion. The fact is we need new text books on pedagogy, history of education, psychology, ethics, and English literature. Then we need badly a series of catechisms well graded for secondary schools and colleges. The text books we have are not exactly what we want. They have served their day and reflect credit on the busy priests and religious communities, but now we want something more up to date; something in keeping with the advance made along the lines of secular text books. The University can, in time, do this work and even now can direct and encourage such work. In a word, the University should be in touch with Catholic education, Catholic thought, and Catholic life from the east to the west, from the north to the south.

A chair on pedagogy should be established. Pedagogy has gone crazy. The text books introduced into our normal schools and high schools and teachers training classes, are a disgrace to all believers in revealed religion. The major part of these text books are taken up with reviling time honored educational institutions, and insulting the most law abiding portion of our glorious republic. The establishment of a Chair of Pedagogy at the University will help to set matters right by teaching the truth about this much distorted subject. It is a charity to teach our neighbors the true meaning of the eighth commandment: "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." This will add weight to the University in educa-

tional matters. Then pedagogical courses established in all our great centres will have a real value. But more of this at another time.

IV.

It is of the utmost importance that the Catholic University succeed, but it must be generously supported through years of struggle. The clergy must encourage it and educate the people up to its nature and necessity. The prelates must exert themselves and see that those in their diocese for whom it was established patronize it. They must not be content with simply giving it approval. They must do more: they must lead the way to raising sufficient funds for its support and endowment. The various educational bodies who have colleges and schools of their own should encourage their young men, on leaving them, to complete their studies in the University.

One of the most encouraging signs of the times is the remarkable clustering of religious orders round this great educational institution. Already the Dominicans, Franciscans, Oblates of Mary, Fathers of the Holy Cross, Sulpicians, Paulists, Marists, etc., have located there and have built or are building magnificent structures for their students. They circle round the University as well disciplined children gather round loving parents. The University represents, through its secular clergy, the root and trunk of this great educational tree, while the various religious orders and the Catholic laity represent its branches, blossoms, and fruitage. The University is the apex, the watch tower; the various religious families of the Church are the walls and fortifications of this great citadel of truth.

Let us build up our University, therefore, on the lines suggested in this Essay, and encourage our new rector, Right Rev. Mgr. D. J. O'Connell, who comes to his new field of labor blessed by our illustrious Pontiff, Leo XIII. The University is a test of the Church's vitality. Catholic charities and Catholic intellects built up and endowed all the great universities of the world. Shall the Catholic charities and Catholic intellects of our glorious republic form an exception? We answer emphatically, *No*.

JOHN F. MULLANY, LL. D.

Syracuse, N. Y.

"LEST WE FORGET."

(Suggested by the late meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science.)

THE British Association for the Advancement of Science held, in October of last year, another of its meetings in the city of Belfast, Ireland. It would indeed be strange if a meeting of this illustrious body should convene and adjourn in that city without some allusion on its part to the famous meeting of twenty-eight years ago. It was here, under precisely the same auspices, that the late Professor Tyndall gave forth to the world his famous utterance, now familiar to the world under the title of the "Belfast Address." That address has, for scientific weal or for scientific woe, now passed into history. The present president of the Association, Professor Dewar, was right when at the recent meeting he referred to Tyndall's famous utterance as "an epoch-making deliverance." An epoch-making deliverance it certainly was, but hardly in the sense mildly intimated by Professor Dewar.

Indeed there was the widest possible difference between the meeting of 1874 and that of 1902, and nothing is more remarkable than the difference of key in which the principal address on each occasion was pitched. Each was a true indication of the spirit prevalent at the time of its utterance. Tyndall's address in 1874 was the prolonged clarion note of nineteenth century science. It was the bugle call to victory. Its vaunting boasts, its insolent aggressiveness, its supreme arrogance, its unhesitating and overweening confidence in the triumph of its manifold hypotheses, its domineering and insulting tone towards all thought which differed from it—whether in the past or in the present, whether in Grecian philosophy or modern religion—its swagger and bravado—all were supremely characteristic of the science of the day; and they are all thrown into marked contrast by the very humble and submissive tone and manner of Professor Dewar's address. It is indeed true that Professor Dewar makes some show of justifying Tyndall's attitude. He does, indeed, quote the words of the bellicose Tyndall in which he vauntingly prophesied "we claim, and we shall wrest, from theology the entire domain of cosmological theory." He even maintains that "this claim has been practically, though often unconsciously, conceded." Nowhere, however, does he pretend to show how or where the famous vaticination has been verified—a proceeding which would have been very much in order, and which we may feel assured would not by any means be omitted, did the facts warrant it, or were the data in hand with which to demonstrate it. Nay, it is an extremely significant fact that the only justification which he seems to find for the

Tyndallic prophesies are the somewhat hasty "concessions" of panic-stricken theologists.

But even the attempted justification of Tyndall's address is manifestly nothing more than the tactics of a skilful general, who makes an attempt at a demonstration for the purpose of covering a retreat; and although the manœuvring of Professor Dewar may still appear to have a slight semblance of lingering pugnacity about it, nevertheless the spirit of belligerency is manifestly broken, the lofty tone of scornful defiance, so long familiar, is conspicuous by its absence; and we are actually informed that science has, at last, assumed an attitude of reverence and humility to which it has long been a stranger. It is even admitted on behalf of the scientist, that, "however seemingly bold may be the speculation in which he permits himself to indulge, he does not claim for his hypothesis more than a provisional validity." And we further learn from Professor Dewar that science has profited somewhat by its late experience; for he also adds, that the scientist "does not forget that to-morrow may bring a new experience compelling him to recast the hypothesis of to-day"—a lesson which it is to be hoped the youthful scientist will lay to heart, inasmuch as it has been so frequently overlooked in the past, and since forgetfulness of it has given rise to so much confusion by confounding hypothesis with certainty and endowing it with all the absoluteness of fact. Indeed there is some danger that the reaction may carry the scientist too far in the opposite direction from the Tyndallic attitude; for, strangely enough, Professor Dewar now boasts of what he is pleased to term "the plasticity of scientific thought, depending on reverent recognition of the vastness of the unknown." In other words science would now seem to boast of the uncertainty of its teachings; and hesitancy and timidity are to take the place of the cocksureness which has so long been regnant in the kingdom of scientific speculation.

This remarkable revolution of scientific sentiment—this reverent and humble attitude of scientists—contrasts so strongly with the attitude of the same body twenty-eight years ago, that no subject can be more interesting than an inquiry into the cause of this change of front. Such an inquiry will be the subject of this article. Not that we can in a few brief pages do justice to a subject for which a volume would hardly suffice; but it is well to remind the scientist of to-day of the precocious dogmatism of the past quarter of a century, lest we, too, pursuing vanities, be filled with foolish imaginings or led by empty conceits.

The fact is, the time has come for adding another chapter to the late Dr. Draper's famous "History of the Conflict Between Science and Religion." The new chapter should be the most interesting, as

it would be the most important, of all. The material (which is so abundant) lies between the famous Belfast address on the one hand and that of Professor Dewar on the other. In the light of recent events there is no more disgraceful chapter in the annals of speculative thought. It should bring the blush of shame to the cheek of every true friend of science to revert to an epoch when scientific vanity was in the ascendant; when truth was sacrificed on the altar of speculation; when dogmatism—loud and blatant—was based on baseless assumption; when all other studies but that of science were insulted and decried; and when even the patient, industrious scientist, who toiled faithfully in his laboratory in search of practical results from applied science, was held up to pity or to scorn.

M. Brunetiere was right when he said some years ago that science was "bankrupt." But this statement was but half the truth. Not only was there a bursting of the scientific bubble, but there seems to have been an attempted hypothecation of fictitious scientific values from the outset; and it is exceedingly difficult to absolve the entire movement from a suspicion of fraudulency and dishonesty from the start. Indeed it is high time to impeach the speculative science of the nineteenth century of high crimes and misdemeanors against the sacred law of scientific truth, whether we regard the results achieved or the methods employed. It appears at the bar of the twentieth century absolutely barren of results; while the unbridled insolence, the impudent and shameless effrontery, the preposterous vanity and conceit, the brutal intolerance, the wanton and revolting arrogance, the brag, the bluster, the boasting and bravado, are without a parallel in the history of civilized thought. The chidings and revilings, the challengings and threatenings have their counterpart only in the prize-ring in our day, in the war-dance of the savage, in the outpourings of Thersites, in the vociferous preludes of Goliath of Geth, or in the *fe, fo, fum* of the nursery-tale giant. To show that we do not exaggerate let us quote—almost at random—from the war-cries of Huxley and Tyndall.

Of Aristotle, the great master-mind of Grecian philosophy, Tyndall unhesitatingly tells us, that "it was not, I believe, misdirection, but sheer natural incapacity which lay at the root of his mistakes." This Aristotelian "incapacity" is thus summed up by the precocious son of the nineteenth-century science:

"Indistinctness of ideas, confusion of mind, and a confident use of language which led to the delusive notion that he had really mastered his subject, while he had, as yet, failed to grasp even the elements of it. He put words in the place of things, subject in the place of object. He preached induction without practicing it, inverting the true order of inquiry, by passing from the general to the particular, instead of from the particular to the general."

The fame of the Stagyrite, however, has been shining with undimmed glory for more than two thousand years, and is to-day as brilliant as ever; while a decade after Tyndall's death, the name of the precocious critic is barely remembered. But if the old "master of those who know" received such usage at the hands of the scientist, woe betide the luckless disciple. Aristotle was dead more than two thousand years; with him there could be no battle. His followers, however, still lived, and they were eagerly challenged to the fray, with the cry: "We fought and won our battle even in the Middle Ages; should we doubt the issue of another conflict with the broken foe?"

This ardor for battle was the true scientific spirit in the age just expiring, and the same scientific warrior outlines the battle-ground in part:

"The impregnable position of science may be described in a few words. We claim, and we shall wrest from theology, the entire domain of cosmological theory."

Now his adversaries were "a band of Jesuits, weaving their schemes of intellectual slavery, under the innocent guise of education." Now it is the Book of Genesis which is flatly told that it "has no voice in scientific questions." Now it is an Anglican Church Congress which is reminded of "its manifold confusions," of its "conflict of vanities," of its "more embroidered colleagues," and which is encouragingly assured that even for it "the light (of science) is dawning, and it will become stronger as time goes on." With the genuine scientific egotism he proclaims his own superiority to the world at large and talks of what "I must regard as the extravagances of the religious world." He laments and commiserates "the very inadequate and foolish notions concerning this universe which are entertained by the majority of our authorized religious teachers." He bewails "the waste of energy on the part of good men over things unworthy of the attention of enlightened heathens." And standing as he did in the midst of so many wild religious unscientific chimeras, he felt himself constrained to enlighten the world and correct its manifold errors "concerning this universe," by giving it "a statement of more reasonable views—views more in accordance with the verities which science has brought to light." Presently we shall see what may be the value of these "more reasonable views," and how vast an improvement they are on "the very inadequate and foolish notions concerning this universe entertained . . . by religious teachers." Such, however, was the courteous language to which opponents were treated.

Huxley's onslaughts on religious thought were, if anything, more arrogant and brutal. He was even more haughty and intolerant

than Tyndall. The strut scientific was with him of the same order, simply deriving a new character from the individual. An unmitigated scorn of everything that did not begin and end in the speculations of physical science was the dominant note in his utterances; while belligerency was his favorite attitude. Opponents were admonished that "extinguished theologians lie around the cradle of every science." They were significantly reminded that "history records that whenever science and orthodoxy have been fairly opposed, the latter has been forced to retire from the lists, bleeding and crushed, if not annihilated, scotched, if not slain." "Orthodoxy," he declared "the Bourbon of the world of thought. It learns not, neither can it forget. And although at present bewildered and afraid to move" it was still declared anathema from science because it hesitated to accept every haphazard hypothesis which the scientists might see fit to broach. Catholicity especially came in for more than its share of the perennial storm from the Huxleyan scientific trade winds. The worst censure which he could pass upon the *Philosophie Positive* of Auguste Comte was to declare that it "contained a great deal as thoroughly antagonistic to the very essence of science as Catholicism." Of one special passage in the *Positive Philosophy* he says that "Nothing in ultramontane Catholicism can, in my judgment, be more completely sacerdotal, more entirely anti-scientific than this dictum." The author of "My Clerical Friends," long ago, made another phrase of Huxley's immortal. It is: "Our great antagonist—I speak as a man of science—the Roman Catholic Church, the one great spiritual organization which is able to resist, and must as a matter of life and death, resist the progress of science and modern civilization." In 1870, during the Vatican Council, Huxley gravely told the Cambridge Young Men's Christian Society that "the Schoolmen are forgotten;" and in the same breath facetiously added, "And the Cardinals—well, the Cardinals are at the Œcumenical Council, still at their old business of trying to stop the movement of the world." At one time he was "helping Providence by knocking impostures on the head." At another he was "whirling featherheads into all sorts of eccentric orbits." Again he was speaking disdainfully of "the comfortable champions of Anglicanism and of Dissent." And all the while with the true spirit of the vandal, he was insisting on overturning and destroying, or, as he himself puts it, "on reopening all questions, and asking all institutions, however venerable, by what right they exist."

The insolence and arrogance were surpassed only by the egotism and vanity which were everywhere visible. Significantly was the world informed that "one or two men were then living who had pro-

duced thoughts which would live and grow as long as mankind lasts." The achievements of Newton, of Cuvier, of Davy, all paled into insignificance beside the wonders of Huxley and Tyndall. The Huxleyan epoch had distanced all past ages "whether we consider the improvements of methods of investigation, or the increase in the bulk of solid knowledge." Nay more, the world was informed that science, by its methods, had leavened the world. It was bidden to "consider that the methods of physical science are slowly spreading into all investigations, and that proofs as valid as those required by her canons of investigation, are being demanded of all doctrines which ask for men's assent." Now, thanks to science—and especially to scientists—"reason has asserted and exercised her primacy over all provinces of human activity, and ecclesiastical authority has been relegated to its proper place." In a word, all the good and great blessings which had come into the world, had come through the instrumentality of science, or better still the scientists. The common herd was gravely admonished that, "if the twentieth century is to be better than the nineteenth, it will be because there are among us men" like Huxley, Tyndall, Darwin and Spencer. It was true their own generation and country might fail to accord due honor to the prophets. Their contemporaries might even fail to recognize their greatness. A few broad hints as to the duties of contemporaries and posterity towards the new prophets that had arisen, might not be superfluous; and accordingly Huxley poses for a *post mortem* statue in language the unqualified assurance and nauseating vanity of which is, we think, without a parallel even in the shameful history of modern scientific warfare.

"Such men," we are gravely told, "are not those whom their own generation delights to honor; such men, in fact, rarely trouble themselves about honor . . . but whether a future generation, in justice and gratitude, set up their statues; or whether names and fame are blotted out from remembrance, their work will live as long as time endures. To all eternity, the sum of truth and right will have been increased by their means; to all eternity, falsehood and injustice will be the weaker because they have lived."

Preposterous as is the vanity and egotism of this extraordinary passage, it becomes ridiculous in the highest possible degree, when we find the hands of the much vaunted science absolutely empty and all its labors barren of results. For what is "the increase in the bulk of solid knowledge" bequeathed to the twentieth century by the speculative scientists of the nineteenth? And what are those high-sounding "canons of investigation" which are being introduced, whose weight and measure are so accurate, that "proofs as valid as those required by science are being demanded of all doctrines which

ask for man's assent?" Correct answers to these queries may help in some measure to clear up questions on which there exists at present a great confusion of ideas.

No one in his senses can deny to the nineteenth century a wonderful advancement upon its predecessors. Its progress has been a natural miracle. The wonders of that marvelous cycle have been positively astounding. From a truly scientific point of view the year 1903 is farther removed from the year 1803 than was that cycle from 1003. The bicycle, the automobile, the trolley wire have revolutionized our modes of locomotion. Electricity has as surely superseded steam power as steam had supplanted horse power. The telegraph and telephone have annihilated time and distance. The phonograph and graphophone have done for the human voice what photography had done for the human features—made them perpetual. *Esto perpetua* is its new charter from science. The advance in agricultural and industrial processes has opened the doors to an entirely new world. The ease and brilliancy with which our homes and streets are lighted provoke a smile at the recollection of the days of the flint and matchlock. Although the advance in therapeutics and prophylactics has by no means kept pace with our progress in other departments of experimental science, the wonderful discoveries of Pasteur and of Roentgen have rescued the medical and surgical world from their comparative stagnation. In electricity the genius of Menlo Park would by his own discoveries alone illuminate a whole century with glory. The marvelous in science no longer excites our wonder. The brilliancy of a new invention or discovery no longer dazzles or intoxicates us. The extraordinary has become the commonplace. Inventions which rank in importance with that of the printing-press, are now the comment of an hour; to-morrow may bring something which completely overshadows to-day. Indeed inventions and discoveries which in former times would have been sufficient to establish the glory of a whole epoch, have become with us almost everyday occurrences; and, consciously or unconsciously, mankind has been driven, by the rapidity of our progress, to adopt *nil admirari* as its rule if not as its permanent motto.

But it cannot be too distinctly emphasized that the science which has conferred such blessings on humanity is by no means the science which has been preaching its own glories so clamorously from the housetops. There could be no greater mistake than to confound the science which is the benefactor of the human race with the science of Darwin, Huxley, Haeckel and Tyndall. There is the widest possible difference between speculative and applied science; and it is applied science that has proved the fairy genius of the

human family. In many respects these two departments of physical science are as widely distinct from, and as wholly independent of, each other as are the science of theology and the science of geology. Applied science which scatters blessings innumerable in its path has no quarrel with anything in the heavens above or on the earth beneath. Indeed if applied science were a disproof of revelation then truly would the cause of the Scriptures be hopeless. If the mechanical and industrial progress of our age conflicts with religion, then indeed there is no God. If steam and electricity contradict Christianity, the Christian cause has been a deceiver. If telegraphy and telephony are opposed to the Divinity of Christ, then is Christianity with all its teachings a barefaced imposture. But—as all the world knows—the inventions of applied science are among the best agencies for the spreading of religious truth, and the geniuses who have by their labors conferred the blessings of modern progress on mankind, have, neither in life nor in death, disdained the consolations of religion. Indeed it is worthy of everlasting remembrance, that while Spencer, Huxley, Darwin, and Tyndall were pursuing wandering fires, while they were busily engaged in monuments of human folly which have crumbled to the dust even before their bones, and while they strove to draw the attention of the world to themselves by their noisy clamors against religion and revelation, there were side by side with them, patient workers—men whose voices were never raised in wordy strife, who never thought it necessary to rail against the existing order of things in order to call the world's attention to the fact of their existence, and who have been the real benefactors of humanity. They have revolutionized science; they have changed the whole face of nature; they have, by their inventions and discoveries in their various departments, enriched mankind; they have furnished the wheels to all modern progress; they have been the true glory of the age; while beside them the railers and jingoes of science sink far into insignificance—their hands empty, their labors fruitless and barren, their theories exploded, their speculations abandoned by the world as worthless mines, their hypotheses repudiated or practically acknowledged as valueless even by themselves, while there remains not one single benefit to humanity left by them to show future generations that such men ever existed. There could be no greater error or one more productive of endless mischief than to confound speculative with practical science, or to credit the glorious results of the patient labors of Edison, Pasteur, Roentgen, Marconi—even of Professor Dewar himself—and a host of other faithful craftsmen, to the noisy and clamorous speculatists who so audaciously lay claim to them.

The truth is that there is no darker page in the chapter of infamy

which we are here outlining, than that which records the attitude of *speculative science* towards *practical* or *applied science* during the past half century. The hatred and scorn with which the speculatists pursued the votaries of applied science may have been the offspring of envy and jealousy; but certain it is that this hatred was surpassed only by their hatred of religion. Every note in the scale of hostility was sounded—scorn, disdain, derision; open contempt and malicious depreciation; affected reconciliation, sullen and reluctant recognition, when the merits of its unresisting rival were too obvious to be ignored; base and cringing flattery when those merits became dazzling; and lastly an audacious attempt to claim the merit and appropriate the glory of our modern material progress. Huxley was—here as elsewhere—the chief spokesman of the speculatists, and we shall quote him freely.

He undertook to draw a sharp dividing line between the science which produces practical results and that of pure speculation. The latter, according to him, was the only science deserving of the name. All else was low, mean, and sordid. He undertook to read the votaries of applied science out of the scientific communion altogether, as degenerate sons not worthy of the noble name science. Lord Bacon had held speculative science in no very high repute, regarding speculation as an unprofitable vanity, while at the same time he strongly urged mankind to pursue science for “its fruits”—its practical results—“the good to men’s estate.” Huxley scouted this doctrine of Bacon in season and out of season. It was gross and vulgar. Those who followed Bacon’s advice were mere “blind readers of the blind . . . who can see in the bountiful mother of humanity nothing but a sort of comfort-grinding machine.” He had only words of biting sarcasm for those who saw in science nothing “more than the improvement of the material resources and the increase of the gratifications of men.” He studied science with far nobler aims. “The great steps in its progress,” he told the world, “have been made, are made, and will be made, by men who seek knowledge simply because they crave it.” He had rather be a kitten and cry mew than one of those same petty science-mongers; for he tells us “I think I would just as soon be quietly chipping my own flint axe, after the manner of my forefathers a few thousand years back, as be troubled with the malady of thought which now infests us all, for such reward”—practical results. Again he assures the world that if benefits to mankind were the only results of scientific pursuits, he “for one, should not greatly care to toil in the service of natural knowledge,” while elsewhere he speaks of the results of such labors as those of Pasteur or Edison as “the coarse and tangible results of

success." Occasionally he combined the cad and the Cockney in his animadversions, as when he says "I do not wish it to be supposed that because I happen to be devoted to more or less abstract and 'unpractical' pursuits, I am insensible to the weight which ought to be attached to that which has been said to be the English conception of Paradise—namely, 'getting on.' I look upon it that 'getting on' is a very important matter indeed." This language, however, is merely simpering and lackadaisical in tone; insult is added in the following: "Far be it from me to depreciate the value of the gifts of science to practical life, or to cast a doubt on the propriety of the course of action of those who follow science in the hope of finding wealth alongside truth, or even wealth alone. Such a profession is quite as respectable as any other." And over and against this insulting taunt flung in the face of the practical scientists of the age, who have been and are its real glory, he sets this: "Nothing great in science has ever been done by men, whatever their powers, in whom the divine afflatus of the truth-seeker was wanting." And still again he tells us "the practical advantages, attainable through its agency, never have been and never will be, sufficiently attractive to men inspired by the inborn genius of the interpreter of nature" to draw them to the study.

On other occasions when, taught by a bitter experience, he had beheld with dismay the despised "practical" science carrying off all the glittering prizes and covering itself with imperishable glory, he strove to make common cause with his insulted rival. Was not he a mechanic himself? Was not he a handicraftsman like the tradesman at his bench? Addressing a body of mechanics, he solemnly assured them "The fact is, I am and have been, any time these thirty years a man who works with his hands—a handicraftsman." And lest his hearers should protest that it was impossible that so fine a gentleman, with such lofty notions about the dignity of science, should be engaged in any such ignoble work, he hastens to forestall all protests by assuring them that "I do not say this in the broadly metaphorical sense in which fine gentlemen, with all the delicacy of Agag, trip to the hustings about election time, and protest that they, too, are working men." And lest the listeners should be appalled by the manifest paradox he hastens to preclude all doubt, by telling them "I really mean my words to be taken in their direct, literal, and straightforward sense." On another occasion he even goes so far as to undertake to break down the barriers between speculative and applied science which he himself had been so eager to set up. Forgetful of his former disdain of "utilitarian ends and merely material triumphs" as well of his sneers at "the coarse and tangible results of success," he declares "I often wish that this phrase 'ap-

plied science' had never been invented. For it suggests that there is a sort of scientific knowledge of direct practical use, which can be studied apart from another sort of scientific knowledge, which is of no practical utility, and which is termed pure science.' " Evidently, however, the reconciliation was not quite to his satisfaction, for in his very last work he says, somewhat drearily—"We may hope that the weary misunderstanding between the practical men who professed to despise science, and the high and dry philosophers who professed to despise practical results (he evidently hopes it forgotten that he was one of them) is at an end." The attempted reconciliation, however, came too late. The divorce of "practical" from "unpractical" science had been too complete. There was only left to the speculative scientists, to claim for themselves the glory of nineteenth century progress, and this they boldly attempted—probably in virtue of the right of eminent domain throughout the whole field of science.

The manner in which the attempt was made was a bold stroke of scientific buccaneering. The audacious attempt is without a parallel in history. Not only was it proclaimed that there were two distinct classes of men engaged in the pursuit of science, the one sordid and base in motive, with mere utilitarian ends in view; the other lofty, noble and godlike in its aims; but what was more, according to the same authority, the speculative scientists were the disciples of Dives who sat down daily to the table of scientific profusion, while the practical scientists were merely the modern Lazaruses who fed on the crumbs that fell from their tables. Thus, with unabashed assurance and unparalleled effrontery, is claim laid to the glory of all our industrial progress by the very men who labored so hard to depreciate and deride it. If we are to believe Huxley, all our modern progress—steam, electricity, the spinning-jenny, the cotton-gin, etc., are but the beggarly pickings from the great marts of pure speculative science which another, but inferior race, of scientists had wit enough to utilize. And this is not so much claimed even, as taken as a matter of course—much after the high-handed fashion of lordly brigands who disdain to stoop to wrangling about trifles. Bless you; the practical results came from speculative science, because science could not help it any more than the sun can help giving light and heat. Therefore the bountiful givers declined all thanks. "It was indeed," we were apologetically informed, "long before speculative science began to produce practical results;" but come they did, at last—as come they inevitably must—from the vast accumulation of bare knowledge. Thanks, therefore, were wholly superfluous. "The new philosophy," Huxley assures us, "deserves neither the praise of its eulogists, nor the blame of its

slanderers. As I have pointed out, its disciples were guided by no search after practical fruits, during the great period of its growth, and it reached adolescence without being stimulated by any rewards of that nature." These "rewards" (practical fruits) came unbidden; the scientists could not bar them out. They, however, were engaged in loftier things. "That which stirs *their* pulses is the love of knowledge and the joy of discovery of the causes of things . . . the supreme delight of extending the realm of law and order towards the unattainable goals," etc., etc. No baseborn utilitarian or practical views debase the true gold of their aims. They hardly sully their hands with sordid "fruits." "In the course of this work, the physical philosopher, sometimes intentionally, much more often unintentionally, lights upon something which proves to be of practical value." The princely votary of science, however, simply flings it to the multitude and scatters his scientific wealth with prodigal hand. "Great," we are informed, "is the rejoicing of those who are benefited thereby;" but the princely Camaralzaman who scatters treasures in such profusion, to be scrambled for by the multitude, has no further interest in the practical utility, and while his princely gift "is being turned into the wages of workmen and the wealth of capitalists" the bounteous scientist is, with "the crest of the wave of scientific investigation far away on its course over the illimitable ocean of the unknown." In other words, speculative science is the fairy god-mother of the human family. She disappears after scattering her gifts; then comes applied science and turns the gifts to account as best it may.

The quiet impudence of this brazen assumption which would despoil the true workers in science of their well-earned glories, only to confer them on the scientific quacks, is enhanced by the consideration of the real merits of the latter in their own special field. After listening to Huxleyan rhapsodies about speculative science, we naturally are led to inquire: What are the results of "pure" science unadulterated by gross utilitarian ends, during the last half century? What triumphs has it to show? What new fruits (not even in the Baconian sense) have been plucked from the tree of knowledge by this vociferous school? To use their own phrase: what has been "the increase in the bulk of solid knowledge" contributed by the clamorous school? After badgering religion, and browbeating philosophy; after bullying and stripping mechanical and industrial science, and unscrupulously attempting to appropriate the glory of the latter, it should have—in its own special sphere—rich treasures of knowledge to show, which it has wrested from the grasp of nature. The reply, here too, is fraught with shame. The hands of speculative science are absolutely empty. Science, as M. Brunetiere has

put it, "is bankrupt." Nevertheless the barren field of knowledge in which he stood did not deter the late Professor Huxley from declaring, shortly before his death, that "our epoch can produce achievements in physical science, of greater moment than any other epoch has to show." It has been said that whom the gods would destroy they first make mad; and it is difficult to account for Huxley's aberration on any other ground. And certainly no other theory can account for the fact that when requested to elaborate the principal "achievements produced by our epoch," he unhesitatingly replied: "There are three great products of our time. One of these is that doctrine concerning the constitution of matter which, for want of a better name, I will call 'molecular;' the second is the doctrine of the conservation of energy; the third is the doctrine of evolution." Here, then, is a categorical summary of the great products of speculative science in our day, issued by one in authority; and we shall discuss it as briefly as possible.

Doubtless many persons interested in the progress of physical science will marvel at this strange summing up of the glories of "our epoch." True friends of science will be inclined to think that it might have been quite as well to have maintained a discreet silence regarding the glorious "achievements of our epoch," under the circumstances. Others will be apt to say: evolution we know; conservation of energy we know—or have heard of; but this molecular constitution of matter; what is it? Certainly it will be news to the world to hear that science has at last determined the ultimate constitution of matter. If true, this fact alone will more than atone for all the insults offered to religion and mechanical science, by speculative science. If the old quarrels between the followers of Aristotle and Democritus are at an end forever, the world has reason to be thankful. But with all due respect to Professor Huxley, we think it would puzzle a speculative scientist at the present day, to say, whether the new scientific decree determining the constitution of matter, has decided the case in favor of Democritus or the Stagyrte.

According to the theory of Democritus, matter in its ultimate elements is composed of atoms which are indivisible and discontinuous, and which move in a vacuum. According to Aristotle matter is continuous and divisible, the smallest particles possible being scattered throughout the attenuated general substance of the plenum. The common illustration of granules of ice diffused through water, to represent the latter; and such granules diffused through absolutely empty space, to represent the former, gives a sufficiently clear idea of the difference of the theories. The atomic theory had almost dropped completely out of sight, while the doctrine of the Stagyrte held sway almost to the present day. Indeed the atomic theory had, in

ancient times, furnished the light comedy in the scientific drama. The Epicureans took up the theory of Democritus. They maintained that the atoms had weight and a certain downward motion natural to them, and thus the world was made. Their adversaries very naturally objected, that since the atoms moved in a vacuum perpendicularly and in parallel lines, they could never unite to form a world; whereupon the atomists thereafter taught that their atoms had "a fortuitous and lateral motion" also; and lest this might not suffice to silence their adversaries, they were fain, as Cicero tells us, to furnish their atoms with hooked tails, by means of which they might unite and cling to one another. This ingenious device, however, did not save them from the raillery of their critics, for they were at once asked: "If the atoms have by chance formed so many sorts of figures, why did it never happen that they should make a house or a shoe? Why at the same rate should we not believe that an infinite number of Greek letters strewn all over a place, might not fall into the contexture of Homer's *Iliad*?" Perhaps it was in search of a refuge from this laughable criticism, that Lucretius was led to declare that the atoms were endowed with volition. However that may be, the theory of Aristotle gained the ascendant, and maintained it until Gassendi, the opponent of Descartes, revived the old Democritic theory of atoms under a theistic form. In our own day the atomic theory has been ably defended by the late Clerk Maxwell, who maintained that the atoms were "manufactured articles;" but as "manufactured articles" implied a manufacturer, Maxwell's theory was received coldly by the materialists, who otherwise seemed willing enough to adopt it. In the hands of Dalton and Avogadro, however, the old Democritic theory proved for a time to be a useful instrument of chemical progress. The four primary elements of the ancients being long since abandoned, and some sixty-eight or more different elements claiming recognition in their stead, the recurrent periodicity into which the new series breaks up, together with the law of multiple proportions under which they combine, has formed the basis for modern crystalline architecture, and established the principles upon which the new synthetic chemistry is constructed.

But here, too, the old farcical element insisted upon coming to the front; for the very periodicity of the series and the laws of combination, gave rise to new ideas fatal to the atomic theory. While the ancient doctrine was revelling in all its newborn glory, and while the laughing philosopher seemed to be seated securely upon his throne, a revolt was raised and the flag of rebellion was unfurled. Skeptics began to inquire whether this kinship and analogy of the atoms did not after all suggest something significant. Verily did it not betray a common origin? And if so quite as surely matter was

neither indivisible nor discontinuous. The doctrine of atoms floating about in a vacuum had received its death-blow, and so the theory of Democritus was devoured by its own children. Manifestly the lesson which the peculiar behavior of the atoms taught, was, that they were parts of a boundless ocean of ether which extended everywhere. These so-called atoms were centres of energy, whirlpools of force, vortex-rings—ant-hills, so to speak, thrown up on the surface of the universal matrix. And then this vast ocean of ether—was it not itself the source from which things were evolved—original matter. Here, surely, was a new discovery, important and far-reaching. But horrors! and absit omen! Where had it landed science? Was not this universal ether a mere return to the *πρωτη υλη* of Aristotle and the *materia prima* of the hated schoolmen?

If speculative science has yet succeeded in extricating itself from this perplexing dilemma, we are not aware of it. Indeed that it is the only goal which they have succeeded in reaching, hardly admits of a doubt. Hence it is easy to form an estimate of the real value of the first of "the three great products of our time, which surpass those of any other age."

The second is the conservation of energy. This is but another name for the familiar doctrine of the correlation of forces; and the great merit of this doctrine is the mathematical accuracy with which it can be computed how much of one form of energy or force is equivalent to another; or, to speak more in accordance with the modern theory, how one mode of energy may be transformed into another. We shall, for the sake of clearness, dwell somewhat on this doctrine.

Of the nature of force or energy science knows precisely as much as it knows about the ultimate constitution of matter, or about space, or about time, or about the unknowable itself; but not one jot or tittle more. It has learned something regarding the manifestations of what it has termed force or energy, and these manifestations it has made some feeble attempts to classify. And here again it is the science which deals with "practical results" that merits all the glory. Outside of applied science the statements of scientists under this head are the wildest of guesses. Indeed it may be said that when we undertake to subtract from the doctrine all that can be stated in the form of exact principle, of uniform application in mechanics and throughout the realm of physics, we are apt to find a somewhat insignificant subtrahend with a rather prodigious remainder. The doctrine has many facets, some of which have a fascination for the experimentalist, but there are others which are not only unproved, but which will not even admit of proof, and it

is here that speculation loves to run riot. But to most people, the doctrine, as it is applied in physics and mechanics, even lacks the charm of novelty. It has frequently been maintained that the doctrine is nothing more or less than an application of the old familiar principle of cause and effect, and that thus it is as old as the human family. And there seems to be much truth in this view.

For example the famous "Joule's equivalent" by which it was demonstrated that a weight of 772 pounds falling through one foot will produce sufficient heat to raise the temperature of a pound of water one degree Fahrenheit; or the familiar phenomena manifested by heat converting water into steam, in which the proportion of heat and steam expansion can be determined with mathematical accuracy, shows conclusively, not only that one form of energy or power may be converted into another, but also proves that, in certain cases, from definite quantities of energy of one kind, definite quantities of another, uniformly arise. But this being admitted it must be also admitted that all this, though not, indeed, formulated into a principle, has been not only recognized, but put into universal application, as long as man has been a thinking and an acting being. The doctrine, as formulated, may not, indeed, have reached to the uneducated masses of mankind; but the principle that one form of energy may be transformed into another has been the unconscious guiding principle of their actions. The most unscientific housewife will calculate to a nicety the quantity of fuel it will require to bring her tea-kettle to the boiling point, though she may never have heard of Joule or Faraday; that is, she transforms the energy in the fuel to another form of energy in the water in her tea-kettle, and housewives had been doing this for centuries before the discovery of the "thermodynamic law." The *chef de cuisine* knows precisely the amount of fuel energy and the amount of spit-turning energy which is necessary to have the roast beef done to a turn, and thus transforms this energy to the roast beef, and thence to the palates of milord and miladi, and thus again to the social energy or cheer, of the hosts and the guests in the dining-room. The wood-chopper and the coalheaver can determine with a fair amount of accuracy the amount of stored energy hidden away in the wood or the coal, which it will be necessary for them to prepare against the rigors of the coming winter, in order that our homes and our public buildings may be supplied with the form of energy which scientists call heat; although neither coalheaver or wood-chopper ever heard that heat was a mode of motion or molecular energy.

And what is still more, without any pretensions to mathematical calculation, even the untutored savage has converted force into force and energy into energy with an accuracy and precision not surpassed

even by Joule's "thermodynamic law," as with unerring aim he sent the whizzing arrow directly to its mark. He had never heard of the correlation of forces, or the conservation of energy; but he applied the principle with mathematical precision. The muscular energy in his arm he transformed into potential energy in the bent bow; this potential energy became kinetic energy the moment the bow became relaxed; the kinetic energy in the bow is instantly communicated to the arrow and converted into energy therein, sufficient to accomplish its deadly purpose. The same Indian knew equally well how much muscular energy was required at the paddle to be converted into canoe energy, by means of which he crossed the river or the bay to reach his tribe or his wigwam in due season; that is, he understood the modern law not only of transformation but even of equivalence, although he might not be able to crystallize his knowledge in a catching phrase. The selfsame forms of potential and kinetic energy, as well as the principle of transformations and equivalences are fully recognized—and applied—though not understood, by children who have not yet attained the reasoning faculty, as they play at see-saw. Each one knows precisely the amount of kinetic energy required at his end to accomplish the requisite amount of potential energy in his partner at the opposite end, which, in turn, becomes kinetic in his companion and is restored to him in the form of potential; and in order to obtain exact equivalences of energy shifts his position on the pole. In the same way the unlettered urchin leaning over the brook and slaking his thirst through the medium of a straw, fully comprehends the amount of muscular energy at the lungs is requisite to cause the water to rise through in a column to his mouth. The muscular energy in the lungs is transformed to energy in the air and thence to energy in the water. The same is true of man's dealing with the elements, long before the discovery of the famous principle. The sailor knew hundreds of years ago how to convert the energy of the winds into the motion of his vessel, and could calculate to a nicety from the velocity of the wind above his head, how much of its energy it was necessary to communicate to his boat, in order to double the cape, or make the shore in a given time. The husbandman, too, had learned to transform the energy of the winds into the energy of the molars which ground his corn or turned his mill, and although man had not succeeded in stealing from Boreas the secret of enchaining the winds, he had learned the art of storing water energy to be applied to his purposes, and of being converted into other energies when necessary. The running energy of the water was converted into falling energy, and then in turn, to the energy of wheels and other rude machinery which did his work and accomplished his ends. Nay, what is more, so long ago

as the thirteenth century the German monk who invented gunpowder had learned the secret of storing and compressing energy, even as the sun stores and compresses its own energy in coal.

It would therefore be strange if the scientists of the nineteenth century did not apply this ancient, world-wide principle in their new arts and inventions. And this is precisely what they have done. They applied the old well-known principle of cause and effect which presses itself on our notice every day, not indeed in a new way, but to new subjects. It is extremely difficult to find in the great doctrine of the conservation of energy anything more than an extension of the old principle which child and savage alike learn instinctively or intuitively to the new subjects of light, heat, electricity, steam, chemical affinity, magnetism. With the new appliances of weights and measures everything ponderable and measurable could be determined with tolerable degree of accuracy, and the calculation of exact equivalents which followed naturally excited the wonder and admiration which are always the concomitants of unexpected—or rather unsuspected—results. The invention of the steam-engine showed that the molecular motion which is called heat may be transformed into visible motion, for as Grove long since put it, "the piston and all its concomitant masses of matter are moved by the molecular dilatation of the vapor of the water." In other words, the energy of heat is transformed into the energy of the moving locomotive, precisely as we have seen that the energy of the winds is transformed into the motion of the sailing-vessel; or as the same wind energy is transformed into the motion of the machinery which, by means of the windmill, grinds the farmer's corn; or as the energy of the water is transformed into the motion of the water-wheel. The principle is precisely the same; the application only is new.

Mechanical science is, indeed, entitled to great credit for its speedy application of the principle in the new field of steam and electricity, and still more for extending it to the fields of light and chemistry; nevertheless it is fairly certain that the progress would have been just the same had the doctrine never been formulated.

But while in the new domain of light, electricity, magnetism, chemical affinity, etc., the application of the doctrine gave definite results; and while the mechanical theory of heat aided this definiteness, especially in mechanics, in no small degree; it was not so easy to establish the principle with accuracy even throughout the whole realm of physics. Quantitatively, there are but few cases in which it is accurately determined how much of any given force is transformable into another given force; qualitatively, there seems to be a fairly general acceptance of the doctrine that, throughout the realm of physics at least, one mode of force is convertible into another

mode. But when this is said, all that can be determined with any sort of accuracy is said. Everything beyond this is simply pure and unalloyed guesswork.

The speculatists, however, or at least those of them who wished to shut out God from the universe, saw, or imagined they saw, in the new—but old—doctrine an effective barrier against divine interference. Herbert Spencer had defined the unknowable as the infinite and eternal energy from which all things proceed. Here then was the corroboration of his doctrine. Energy was convertible into another form or into many forms; but it was indestructible. It was not known—indeed, it could not be shown—to have come into existence anywhere except as a change from another form of energy; hence it was ingenerable. Being both ingenerable and indestructible, might it not be safely assumed that the quantity of force or energy in the universe could neither be increased nor diminished? The persistence of force, then, was the actual marriage of science and religion. “The sole truth which transcends experience by underlying it, is thus the Persistence of Force.” In asserting it “we assert an Unconditioned Reality, without beginning or end;” and thus “we reach that ultimate truth in which Religion and Science coalesce.” Thus in the doctrine of the conservation of energy—legitimate enough within proper bounds—we have a comfortable Spencerian pantheism. We do not indeed touch the infinite energy directly at every point where energy is manifested; but if Mr. Spencer will permit a simile in anything so sacred—we are like the performer who touches only the keys of the organ, while the music is encased from view and far from irreverent touch in the noble and majestic pipes.

Similarly the doctrine was supposed to further the cause of evolution, and thus its praises rang all along the line of scientific speculations. It was extended from hand to hand. The physicist handed it over to the physiologist, who declared—with but scant proof however—that it held good throughout the kingdom of living and sentient things. The human body was but a dynamic engine, moved by the energy stored up in the food consumed. At once a new industry sprang up among the scientists. Tabulated equivalents of animal energy became the order of the day. With all the infallibility and oracular solemnity of the Delphian Apollo we were told that certain kinds of food were brain-food, or muscle-food, or bone-food. Physicians followed the teachings of the physiologists. They forgot—as well as the former—that the human frame may be a chemist’s mortar as well as a dynamic engine; and they failed also to remember the old homely but truthful adage that “one man’s meat may be another man’s poison.” The human machine was treated to the same fuel

under all manner of circumstances, as the steam-engine is always treated to coal. The result is ridiculous in the extreme. The hygiene of yesterday is flung aside for the hygiene of to-day. "Renowned" scientists are in conflict. The eminent specialist is contradicted by the specialist still more eminent, and the science of hygiene and medicine is a laggard in the race of progress. Such are some of the benefits which the doctrine of the conservation of energy has brought to the field of medicine.

From vital energy there was but a step to nervous and emotional energy; and having reached thus far it was inevitable that the doctrine should be extended to mind and intellect as well. Thought and consciousness were—like heat—merely modes of motion. Mr. Spencer even goes so far as to assure us that "those modes of the Unknowable which we call motion, heat, light, chemical affinity, etc., are alike transformable into each other, and into those modes of the Unknowable which we distinguish as sensation, emotion, thought: these, in their turns, being directly or indirectly re-transformable into the original shapes." The field of social energy was the only one left to be included in the sweep of the doctrine, and now we are solemnly assured that stars and thoughts, the steam-engine and the White House reception, are all alike products of the same principle; that through the entire cycle of physical, vital, mental, political and social phenomena, it is the self-same energy that is at work; that it cannot be increased or diminished throughout the universe; that it gives us now a poem or a polyp, a sonnet or a sausage, a nebula or a congressman; that it is the same energy which brings the railroad train to the terminus and the newly-elected politician to his office, and that, moreover, all these forms of energy are transformable into one another.

And for all this extravagant statement and much more of the same sort, we are quite nonchalantly told there is not a particle of proof whatever. Bless you; if you will not take it on the authority of the scientists, without proof, what are the scientists for? Herbert Spencer will tell you quite candidly that no process of induction can corroborate their assertion; the doctrine "cannot be inductively confirmed." With equal candor he will tell you that it is simply a corollary from the doctrine of the persistence of force; but that the persistence of force is a mere assumption. Just as one might say the doctrine must be true because Mr. Spencer so declares it to be; that it is a corollary of Mr. Spencer's infallibility; but that Mr. Spencer is infallible is, however, a mere assumption. It is true Mr. Spencer, by a species of verbal jugglery—not by any means uncommon with him—substitutes what he calls the force out of consciousness with

the force known to consciousness; but the vicious reasoning is augmented rather than diminished by the substitution. When we add that the Spencerian maintains that the amount of energy in the universe cannot be increased or diminished because of its relation to the Infinite Energy from which all things proceed, and therefore that it is *infinite*; that other evolutionists, following Helmholtz, maintain the same theory because "the amount of power in nature and in all parts of nature, including the domain of life, is inexorably limited," and that therefore it is *finite*; that the accepted doctrine involves the acceptance of the atomic theory of matter with all that it includes—the indivisibility of the atoms, and the interatomic and intermolecular spaces; and that the atomic theory, as far as we know, is at the present day, giving way to the theory of Aristotle; and lastly that—if we are to take Professor Dewar's remark at Belfast as the latest authoritative exposition of the subject—"ignorance of the ultimate nature of matter, of the ultimate nature of energy, and still more of the origin and ultimate synthesis of the two," is now candidly admitted on the part of science; it can be readily computed how much glory is due to science on behalf of the second "great product of our age." The fact seems to be that in the famous doctrine, what is true is old; and what is new is vicious—both scientifically and philosophically vicious.

Fortunately for the doctrine, the late Clerk Maxwell rescued it from the hands of its friends and reduced it to some sort of rational definiteness. He thus defines it: The total energy of any body or system of bodies is a quantity which can neither be increased nor diminished by any mutual action of such bodies, though it may be transformed into any one of the forms of which energy is susceptible." While this definition fails somewhat in point of clearness of language, and while in the present state of scientific ignorance regarding the nature of energy, it asserts what is not exactly demonstrable, it is a praiseworthy attempt to free the doctrine from the wild vagaries and fancies of the speculatists. Doubtless it was to the wholesome influence of the framer of the definition that Huxley in his very last work returned to saner views than those which he formerly held; for he expressly stated that "the phenomena of consciousness which arise, along with certain transformations of energy, cannot be interpolated in the series of these transformations, inasmuch as they are not motions to which the doctrine of the conservation of energy applies." This is certainly in marked contrast with his former famous dictum on the same subject: "I believe that we shall, sooner or later, arrive at a mechanical equivalent of consciousness, just as we have arrived at a mechanical equivalent of heat. It

is also recessional from that other famous step in the ascent of Jacob's scientific ladder to the materialist paradise, in which he declared "it must be true . . . that the thoughts to which I am now giving utterance, and your thoughts regarding them, are the expression of molecular changes in that matter of life which is the source of our other vital phenomena." Verily the angels of science had, towards the end of life, begun their descent, at least to the extent of one round in the ladder of the conservation of energy.

We have dwelt long on this because it is one of the most conspicuous examples of the modern scientific mountain parturition, and because, like the doctrine of evolution, so many well-meaning people are ready to accord to it a value which it by no means possesses.

On the hypothesis of evolution it is not necessary to dwell long here. It is merely necessary to say that even its strongest advocates must admit that the doctrine is not only unproved but unprovable; that even were the doctrine of special creation out of the way, evolution could not even then make good its case; that the sole reason of its revival by Darwin lay in the purely imaginary agency of natural selection which is now openly scouted by its former advocates; that natural selection having broken down, and no substitute for it worthy of attention having been discovered, the doctrine stands precisely where Darwin found it. Nor can it be said that the facts of paleontology constitute a probability in its favor. In the present status of our knowledge of these facts and their significance, paleontology can constitute a probability in favor of nothing. The geological record is indeed an open book, for him who can read it; but every attempt of science to read "the riddle of the rocks" has been—and is ever apt to be—a more or less brilliant piece of guesswork. The tyro who has mastered the Hebrew alphabet and learned the meaning of a word or two here and there, but nothing more, will be sorely puzzled on opening the Hebrew Bible for the first time. He may be able to tell each letter and read an occasional word, but whether he should begin at top or bottom, at right hand or left, or how he is to extract a meaning from the whole is wrapt in mystery for him. The geologist and paleontologists are in precisely the same difficulty. They have learned the alphabet, but the significance of the record can with them be nothing more at best than more or less clever surmises. And should any one undertake to say that at the beginning God sent forth from His hands a new and furnished world and point to the geological record as evidence of his statement, he could do so quite as justly as the evolutionist.

Since Balzac wrote his famous *Peau de Chagrin*, that ingenious fable has often been taken as the symbol of shrinking values. The

wild asses' skin brings to its wearer the gratification of every wish, but the skin—and with it the wearer—shrinks at every gratified desire, until at last skin and hero shrink into nothingness. This symbolizes the Darwinian theory exactly. Magnificent as was once the prospect, there has been an uninterrupted shrinkage of the doctrine, and the time seems to be not far distant, when the *peau de chagrin* of Darwinism will have shrunk to nothingness, and with it the happiness of the Darwinian.

Indeed, the entire movement was a revolt, not so much against religion as against the limitations of the human intellect. Of any given number of scientific theories of the universe, the most that can be claimed in favor of any one, is merely a balance of probability; while over and above all of them is the still stronger probability that all of them are wrong. Still science insists that of itself, unaided, it can read the riddle of the universe, in spite of the admitted incompetency of the man's intellectual powers. On this point each generation refuses to be guided by the experience of the past. There seems to be an adamant decree of fate that each generation must learn the hard lesson, by experience, for itself. It is the human mind struggling to wrench the prison bars of its own limitations; as the eagle might undertake to outstrip his own flight, or the mettlesome steed might fret because he cannot fly. Man quarrels with the insufficiency of his own powers, like a petulant child, and imagines he is combating the church, authority, religion. It is the old battle of the centaurs over again, or a renewed effort to rebuild the tower of Babel, in order to scale the heavens. Each new set of actors on the stage of life take up the task with fullest confidence. At life's close they are a little wiser. If they could only bequeath their convictions to their successors!

This article is already long and yet the task we set out to perform is only half done. We have merely inquired into "the increase in the bulk of knowledge" which the scientists of the past generation have left to us. The "proofs" whose "validity" were to become the world's standard, the "methods of physical science," which were to leaven the world of knowledge, the "canons of investigation," have not been touched upon. They, however, constitute the most shameful page of all in the record of scientific dishonor, and it may be worth while to return to the subject.

S. FITZSIMONS.

Lima, N. Y.

[Postscript.—Since the foregoing article was printed and proof corrected, the June number of the *Nineteenth Century* has come to hand; and it is a pleasure to find men like Lord Kelvin taking a step far in advance of Professor Dewar at Belfast, and, in the name

of science, openly avowing a Creative Power. In his notice of Professor Henslow's lecture Lord Kelvin says: "I cannot admit that, with regard to the origin of life, science neither admits nor denies Creative Power. *Science positively affirms Creative Power.*" Again he says: "If you think strongly enough *you will be forced by science to the belief in God*, which is the foundation of all religion. You will find science not antagonistic but helpful to religion." These words are worthy to be placed alongside of Pasteur's noble words, "*True science—that leads to God.*" Regarding the atomic theory of matter and ether Lord Kelvin says: "Ether is absolutely non-atomic; it is structureless, and utterly homogeneous where not disturbed by the atoms of ponderable matter," and he quotes from Cicero almost the selfsame words we have quoted in the preceding article in ridicule of the atomic theory. It is a healthy sign to see the two leading scientists of the age—the late Pasteur in France and Lord Kelvin in England—repudiating openly the agnosticism, atheism and materialism of their late contemporaries. It shows that in science much more than anywhere else, Pope's lines are true: "A little learning is a dangerous thing," and that only deep draughts of "the Pierian spring" can keep the brain steady and the senses sober. Let us have no more of the sounding brass, the tinkling cymbals, the empty vessels—loudest sounding of all, however—in physical science.—S. F.]

THE PASSING OF MARY.

AMONG men who call themselves Christians there exist two theories in regard to the nature of the Church. The first holds that a full and sufficient revelation has been made, once and for all, and entirely contained within the holy Scriptures. Such a view must necessarily allow great latitude in the individual interpretation of the Scriptures because the theory makes no provision for anything like an authoritative hermeneusis. The second theory holds not only that a divine revelation has been given but also that a divine interpreter has likewise been given. To the first the Church presents itself as a mechanism, hard and fast, which has been wound up and goes; to the second the Church is a living organism, the means of outward expression of a Person and that Person is no less than the Holy Ghost himself.

The Church possesses the fulness of divine truth, but that truth is made known to men gradually. As to new-born babes the milk of the word is given to men and afterward, as their spiritual strength increases, as their perception of God and His works grows more

and more, is strong meat set before them, more and more are the deeper meanings of God's truth made plain. The Church changes not; the Church does not teach anything new; she is identical now with the Church of the first hundred years, but there is a deepening and a fuller understanding of her teaching on the part of men as time goes on; there is a clearer definition of what once was dark, a keener perception of what was once obscure. Now all this takes place because of the Holy Ghost, a divine Person, revealing truth to other persons who are human. This must be done through the natural working of men's minds under divine illumination. And so, as with the individual man when some problem comes before him for solution, there is a process of thought, there is deduction from known premises to unknown truth, in the same way is there progress in matters of faith in the mind of the Church of God. "How much more readily should we believe," says an author quoted by Benedict XIV., "with how much more certainty define than the first ages just because the Church increases her wisdom with the passing years, because, showing the light received from the Holy Ghost under whom she is ever taught and governed, she is illumined by ever later councils and by the fuller consensus of more enlightened doctors."¹

This gradual progression, we believe, holds in matters of devotion as well as in matters of faith. Indeed, the former as not fully shown in the holy Scriptures gives an even wider scope for continually progressive teaching on the part of the Holy Ghost. Now among those teachings which approximate to faith is that concerning the bodily taking into heaven of Mary, the blessed Mother of God, and I wish to try and show, if possible, what were the stages, what the gradual unfolding of belief in Mary's assumption as evidenced by the monuments of the Church in the past.

There were many, without any doubt, who knew of Mary's assumption from the very first. There were the Apostles, there were her friends, there was the whole Church at Ephesus; and the mystery of her passing must have been told to numerous converts, to many devout and faithful souls. If it be asked why the Apostles and early writers say nothing of the matter, it can be answered, as Glyca says,² that these men were engaged in teaching only those truths which were absolutely necessary for salvation, and that they were content to leave in God's hands His Mother's honor to make clear her glory when He would.

And yet, very early there must have arisen questions, wonderings—where was she, the Mother of God? Had she indeed died as

¹ Cancellatus, *annal. Marlan.* an 72, no. 21. Quoted by Benedict XIV., *de festis*, lib. II., c. 8, 23.

² *Annal. pars. III.*, p. 281.

others, or was she living in some secret hiding-place of God far from men's eyes?

And so Epiphanius seems to speak not for himself alone but for many when he says:³ "I know not whether of that blessed virgin any obscure traces can be found which will assure us of her death. On the one side is Simeon's prophecy, on the other, in the Apocalypse it is written of the woman who bore the Child to whom wings were given that she might flee afar. Perhaps this was fulfilled in Mary; I do not know it certainly; I cannot definitely declare that she lives immortal, nor can I be sure that she is dead. The Scriptures surpass the mind of man and we should not be over curious concerning this precious and excellent vessel of God." So doubtless the faithful felt at first that it was the part of piety not to enquire too diligently, that this silence, this mystery best became the end of her who had lived so hidden from the world; that as her wondrous overshadowing by the Holy Ghost was a thing beyond all words, between God and Mary alone, so too how God had taken her to himself was another secret and they knew it was well to hide the secret of the King. Thus were they content to wait.

It is the part of God's providence to use natural and human means to bring about His glory, and so it was that the heresy of Nestorius, and the discussions to which it gave rise, served to bring Mary and her part in the Incarnation into prominence. Now was she shown to all men to be *θεοτόκος*, Mother of God, and, as such most worthy of all reverence and worship. It was about that time, certainly it was due to this effect on men's minds, that a feast began to be kept in the Blessed Virgin's honor during the winter months. In Gaul this feast was celebrated on January the eighteenth. "And this festival," says Mabillon,⁴ is most certainly that of the Assumption,"⁴ although it seems to have had no name as yet. This was before the year 560.

In the Sacramentary of Gregory (591) the same feast is also kept on the same day, and it is found in the Gothic Missal noted for celebration on the second Sunday after the Epiphany.⁵ This last liturgy was in use in Gaul in 678 and the office for this day contains explicit reference to Mary's bodily assumption into heaven.

Such seems to be the earliest records of the feast of Mary's Assumption. So far the feast was nameless, but soon it began to be called *Dormitio*—the Falling Asleep of Mary. Such was its name in Gaul as Gregory of Tours bears witness,⁶ saying it was first celebrated while Gregory I. was pope "in the middle of the eleventh

³ *Adv. haeres.* Lib. iii., Tom. 2, 11.

⁴ *Lit. Gall.*, lib. ii., no. 22.

⁵ Menard, 456 in *libro Sac. Greg.* Thomasius de Sac., lib. ii.

⁶ *Lib. i.*, de gloria Martyr., c. 9.

month," i. e., January 18. We are thus enabled to identify the Dormitio with the unknown feast of the Gallic Missal.⁷

The old Roman Martyrology (Circ. 600) has the Dormitio, as has also an ancient calendar of about 700.

The Sacramentary of Gregory seems to evidence a passing from this stage to the next. In some manuscripts the word "assumptio" is found; in others not. Such an authority as Tommasini⁸ says this word is never used before the ninth century, and Muratori, also, denies that it was originally employed by Gregory, and thinks it was added later.⁹ On the other hand, the editor of the Sacramentary in Migne, under the date "XVIII. Kal. Sept.," gives "Solemnia de Pausatione Sanctæ Mariæ."

The same thing can be noticed in Usuard and Ado (878); the vigil of the feast is that of the assumption; the feast itself is termed "Dormitio." It is about this time, too, that we find the date changed from January to August 15. This, Nicephorus says,¹⁰ was done by the Emperor Maurice (cir. 580), who ordered that "in every place the feast of Dormitio should be celebrated on August 15."

This confusion of name and change of date mark a further advance in the Church's understanding of the assumption. More and more did men see that Mary did not merely fall asleep in the Lord, but that there was a further glory, a greater honor. The truth known to the Apostles and the few faithful was becoming understood by all, the obscure tradition was becoming a luminous fact.

And so we come to the final stage where the word "Assumptio" is wholly used and wherein Mary's bodily taking up is, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, at length made clear to all. And this, according to Muratori, took place before the year 800. He gives as proof, besides the proclamation of Maurice and the words of Gregory of Tours which I have already noticed, the following facts: About the year 690 Sergius I. ordered that litanies should be said "before the feasts of the Nativity and Assumption of the Mother of God." In 866, moreover, Pope Nicholas was asked by envoys from Bulgaria, who wished to submit to the Church, what fasts it was needful for them to keep. Nicholas replied, "Those which from antiquity the Roman Church has received." And then he proceeds to recount, mentioning among them the vigil of the Assumption.¹¹ Now in the Gelasian Sacramentary (495) there is no fast preceding the Assumption, but if Nicholas could speak of such a fast as kept "from antiquity" it must have been added very soon after that time.

⁷ Mabil. *ibid.* Muratori *de rebus liturg.*, lib. I., c. 2.

⁸ *De Sac. in Ass.*

⁹ *Cap. v.*

¹⁰ *H. E.* xvii., c. 18.

¹¹ See also Martene *de divin. Celebr.*, Of. xxxiii., 18.

So it is fair to assume that the "Assumption" itself must have been celebrated long before the age of Nicholas. In fact Muratori concludes that "there can be no question" but the feast was known before the year 800. Thenceforth it is known in the Roman Church by the name "Assumption" and by no other.

Concerning this word *Assumptio* the learned Benedict XIV. has some remarks which are well worthy of note.¹² Speaking of the gradual enlightenment of men's minds concerning the end of the Blessed Virgin he says that the Latin verb *assumo* was used at first merely with the meaning of God's taking human souls to Himself, and afterward, gradually, as faith deepened, it was clearly seen that in Mary's case God had taken not only her soul but her body. Among the authors who use the word in its simpler sense is Gregory of Tours (*de gloria Conf.* c. 49), who speaks of "*assumptio Sancti Aviti*;" Eusebius (*de vita Const.* lib. iv.) writes, "*illum ad Deum suum assumptum*;" Gregory Nazianzen in a sermon on his sister Gorgonia, uses the expression "*eam fuisse assumptam in cœlum*." We must consider in Mary's case, says the learned pontiff, of what grade was her union with and taking up to God—whether partial or entire, that is, of both soul and body.

So far I have spoken only of the date of the Assumption; it remains to say something concerning the description of that event as given by Christian writers.

The first authentic mention of Mary's death is made by Dionysius the Areopagite in his book "*De divinis Nominibus*," chapter third. The writings which pass under this name are assigned generally to the sixth century.¹³ The passage is quoted by all the Greek writers who treat of the assumption and as it is interesting I translate it. Dionysius is writing to Timothy about his teacher and bishop Hierotheus. "There was a gathering," he says, "of God-inspired angels when I, as you know, and many other of our brethren came to behold that body which had once received the God and author of life. James was there, the Lord's brother, and Peter, the first and highest of men learned in the ways of God, and others were likewise there. Then, after that beholding, we saw how each—all the holy ranks—as best they could, with hymns glorified the omnipotence of divine goodness. You remember well enough how he (Hierotheus) surpassed all the other mystics, himself wholly forgetful, rapt away from earth through sympathy with what he sang, so that they who heard and saw him both knew and knew him not and they judged him to be inspired, a singer of God's own hymns."

There exists a little book credited to Melito, bishop of Sardis, and

¹² *De pert. in Ass.*, lib. II., c. 23.

¹³ *Tommasi, de fest.*, lib. II., sec. 20, No. 10.

called "The Passing of Mary" (*De Transitu Mariæ*) which undoubtedly gives the first circumstantial account of Mary's death and assumption. Melito lived in the second century. He is known to have written an apology for his fellow Christians about 170, but the names and some fragments of his works¹⁴ are all that have reached us.¹⁵

As to the book *De Transitu* critics are agreed that it must have been written considerably after Melito's age, probably during the controversy with Nestorius. At all events, the first notice of it is by Gelasius in 495.¹⁶ Although the book has been faulted by later writers¹⁷ as contrary to certain details in the Acts of the Apostles (though it would seem that Melito might be reconciled with the Scriptures), nevertheless as its main facts have been received by fathers of the Church we must believe that the work is substantially true.

St. Gregory of Tours¹⁸ gives an account of the Assumption taken, with often the very same expressions, from the work of Melito. He was writing in 594. These are the earliest authentic instances, as critics universally believe the epistle credited to Jerome and the sermons to St. Augustine are very much later than those fathers.

The epistle of Jerome to Paula and Eustochium¹⁹ could only have been written, Erasmus says, by a Greek and this must be a Greek translation. From other internal evidence it must have been later than Jerome's age, for the author speaks of heresies concerning the Incarnation; he asks his readers to beware of the Orientals "lest your eyes be clouded with darkling words, or they blind your Latin purity with a storm of Greek dust."²⁰ Now such words as these could only have been written after the first Council of Chalcedon.

There are, moreover, two sermons²¹ printed in the works of Augustine which treat of the Assumption, but as they are likewise found among the writings of Aupert or Fulpert, a writer of the eleventh century, and as they bear every indication of having been written at that time, critics do not hesitate to deny Augustine's authorship.

Later, of course, Latin writers are numerous, but writing when the Assumption was universally recognized, they have not the historical value of earlier fathers.²²

¹⁴ Eusebius H. E. iv., 28 seq. Jerome de vir. illustrat. 24.

¹⁵ For a full and critical account of Melito and his works see the dissertation by Charles Woog in the eighth volume of Migne's Greek patrology.

¹⁶ Gelasius cap. S. Rom. dist. XV.

¹⁷ Bede in retract. Act., c. viii.; Jerome in Act., c. viii.

¹⁸ De Mirac., lib. i., c. 4.

¹⁹ Ep. IX. de Ass.

²⁰ Ibid. 2, xiii.

²¹ Serm. de Sanctis 35 and 36.

²² Among these later are Ildephonsus, Serm. 6 de Ass. Peter Damian, de Ass.; Peter of Blois, serm. 28. For a full account of mediæval notices see Benedict XIV. in his tract on the feast and Baronius, ann. 48.

The Greeks, naturally, entered much more fully into the question, and among them may be cited St. John of Damascus (3 sermons in Dorn), Andrew of Crete and German of Constantinople, both of whom have homilies on the feast, Modestus (Serm. 5, pars B.), Metaphrastes (Hist. p. 330), Nicephorus (H. E. lib. ii., c. 21 and lib. xv., c. 14), Cedrinus (in Aug. 15, s. 38-42), Glyca (annal. pars iii., p. 231). All these writers agree so curiously and use words and expressions so similar as to make me believe that all are quoting from one common account, although we do not know what it is.

In order that the reader can see exactly how these early histories read I subjoin a summarized translation of the pseudo-Melito and of the words of Nicephorus. The latter is chosen because he is rather fuller than other Greek writers, and entirely representative. The account of Mary's death is drawn from the second book of his ecclesiastical history, section 21; the speech of Juvenal, from the fifteenth book, section 14.

The Passing of Mary is as follows:

"The second and twentieth year after Our Lord had ascended to the heavens it chanced on a day that Mary, burning with love of him, wept alone within her house. Then behold, an angel stood by her, shining with great light, and saluted her saying Hail! thou blessed of the Lord, lo! here is a palm branch which I bring thee from the paradise of God, the which shall be borne before thy bier when on the third day thou shalt be taken up from the body; for thy Son awaits thee with all his angels. Then Mary said I beseech thee that all the Apostles may come together to me: and the angel answered Lo! all the Apostles of my Lord, lifted up, shall to-day come to thee.

And the angel departed from her.

Then Mary arose and put on her best garments, and going forth prayed at the Mount of Olives. Now it came to pass in Ephesus, on the Lord's day, while blessed John was preaching that there was a mighty earthquake and a cloud received him from the eyes of all and bore him to the house of the Virgin Mother. And all the Apostles in a like manner from the places where they preached the word were lifted up and rapt away and set down before the door. And they inquired "What is the cause that the Lord hath brought us to this place?" Then John came forth and showed them all things. So they entered into the house and saluted Mary and she said to them: "The Lord hath brought you here for a comfort against the woes to come; and now I pray watch until the third day even until that hour when the Lord shall come and I shall depart from the body." So for three days they waited praising the Lord.

And on the third day, about the third hour, lo! Our Lord appeared with a great multitude of the heavenly host praising God. And the Saviour said "Come, my chosen, my precious pearl, enter into the abode of eternal life."

And Mary threw herself prone and adored the Lord.

Then afterward that blessed Virgin rose and lay upon her bed and giving thanks to God sent forth her spirit. But the Apostles saw only a great light whiter than snow and more shining than all silver.

Then our Lord commanded the Apostles to bring Mary's body to the tomb and to watch for three days; and he himself gave her soul to Michael the Archangel who is the keeper of paradise, and Gabriel went with her. And by Our Lord and his angels she was immediately received into heaven.

Now there were three virgins there who prepared Mary's body for the grave, and when they had put off her garments the body shone with so great a light that they could by no means behold the body. And when they had washed the body they clothed it with the linen garments of the dead. But when the body was clothed the light by degrees grew less until it wholly vanished away. Then the face of Mary, God's mother, was like to the flowers of the lily, and a fragrance went forth from her so that no fragrance could be found like to it.

Then the Apostles laid the body on a bier and they said "Who shall carry the palm?" And they gave the palm to John, because he was a virgin

chosen of the Lord. So they went forth singing "When Israel came out of Egypt: Allelula." And behold as they went a great miracle, for a crown of cloud, very great, appeared over the bier as a great circle is wont to appear in the splendor of the moon and the hosts of angels were in the cloud chaunting sweet hymns and the earth sounded with the sound of the sweetness.

Then from the city came forth a great multitude, a thousand and fifteen men, greatly wondering. And one approached and would lay hold on the bier to overthrow it, and lo! his arms became fastened to the bier so he could in no wise loosen them. And at the same moment the whole crowd of the people were smitten with blindness by the angels. Then the man begged Peter to loose him from the bier, and Peter being moved did so. And he said to the man, "Take the palm and go into the city and lay it upon the people's eyes and tell them the great works of God and they shall see." And the man did as Peter said to him.

Then the Apostles bore the body of Mary to the valley of Josaphat, to the tomb there as the Lord had showed them. And they laid her in the tomb and closed the door and sat before it as the Lord commanded. And suddenly the Lord Jesus appeared with his angels and said, "Peace be with you." And he asked them what should be done for her who was his mother; and Peter and the others said, "Lord, thou didst choose this thy handmaid to be thy immaculate dwelling place; so then it seems to us that as thou, having overcome death doth reign in glory, shouldst in a like manner quicken thy mother's body, that thou mayest bring her to be joyful with thee forever in heaven."

The Lord answered, "Be it according to your word." And he commanded Michael to bring back the holy soul of Mary. Then behold Gabriel rolled back the stone from the door of the sepulchre, and the Lord said, "Rise, my love, my fair one, who hast not known stain nor hast felt corruption in the tomb." And immediately Mary rose and came forth from the tomb and threw herself at the Lord's feet and adored him. And the Lord kissed her and gave her to the angels to bear into paradise. And he said to the Apostles, "Come near." And they came near and he kissed them, and said, "Peace be with you: lo I am with you even to the end of the world. And when he had thus said he was lifted up, and the clouds received him and the angels with him, bearing the most blessed mother of God into God's paradise. But the Apostles were borne up and carried each one to his own place, glorifying God and Jesus Christ, who liveth and reigneth with the Father and Holy Ghost, in perfect unity and one substantial divinity, for ages of ages.—*Amen.*

The death of Mary as told by later writers differs somewhat from Melito's account, although in no important particular. These are the words of Nocesphorus:

When Claudius had reigned five years, and the blessed mother of God was living her sixty-first year, her Son's message came to her through an angel that she must die. Mary received that message with exceeding joy, and began to make ready for the coming of her Son. Lights were kindled throughout the house: the house itself was swept and garnished: Mary's friends and kin-folk were called and all was made ready, rightly and in order. When John was present, and women who were joined to Mary by kinship and love, that blessed Virgin showed the palm which she had received from the angel's hand, and said that she now must die. And all present wept at that word, pouring forth a flood of tears. Then Mary's two garments she ordered to be given after her death to two poor widows who had shown her good. Even while she was yet speaking thunder and storm was heard, and immediately the Apostles were present gathered from all the earth. Mary received each one and prayed for what each most desired, and blessed them, and said farewell, and bade them not to grieve, for that her passing should be a cause rather of joy than tears. Then did she give directions for her burial and her tomb, and she called to her Peter and the rest who came with shining faces. As they stood gathered about her couch, Mary gave thanks to God and composed herself decently, and with a sweet smile crying out Let it be to me according to thy word, she gave up the ghost.²³

There is a material difference in the accounts of Mary's resurrection and taking up as given by the later Greek writers and Melito.

²³ Nicesph. H. E., lib. II., c. 121. German, Const. 3 serm. in Dor.

The later writers say that Marcian and Pulcheria, rulers of Constantinople, had built there a splendid church called the Church of Mary in Blachernæ. They wished to have her body preserved in it as a relic, and so when Juvenal, bishop of Jerusalem, had come thither to attend the Council of Chalcedon, they asked him if he were willing to give over her holy body. Juvenal answered "that in the holy Scripture nothing is written of Mary's death, but that from a very ancient and authentic tradition, it had come down that at the time of her passing the Apostles, who were preaching over all the world, had been lifted up and carried to Jerusalem. There they heard divine songs; and then, in a wholly wondrous and divine way, Mary's Son had appeared and received into His hands her holy spirit. Her sacred body, amid the hymns of angels was carried forth to Gethsemani and laid in the tomb, and for three days the angelic singing had continued. On the third day Thomas came, and the Apostles went with him to open the tomb that he might venerate Mary. When the tomb was opened the body was not found but only the linen grave-clothes untouched and unharmed which gave forth a delicious odor. The Apostles departed and they could only come to this conclusion: that God, the Word, and Lord of glory, who had once been pleased to take of her flesh, had now glorified her body, undefiled and immaculate, with immortality before the general resurrection. Through the ministry of angels had He conveyed that body from corruption to some abode of celestial light, so that she might rise apart from other men even from the most praiseworthy and renowned."

J. H. W.

SOCIAL REFORM.

THE student of the whole reform movement of the present is much attracted by the strength, earnestness and sincerity of most of the work done, by the widespread conviction that something must be done quickly, and by the hopeless diversity of view, method, aim and philosophy, to be found among those most earnestly engaged. That many of these differences are due to psychological traits found among advanced reformers, was shown in a study of those traits in the April *Quarterly*. Still many phases of reform remain unexplained. Whether we take different social problems into account, or, ignoring their differences, confine thought to any one problem, we find even here confusion, disorganization, warring views and wasted effort, because of some fundamental differ-

ence among the reformers themselves. Mutual understanding among them would lead to the accomplishment of much more good at an expense of energy less than that now consumed in aimless work. The great lesson needed by reform—we may well say, by modern society itself, is that of the unity of life—the oneness of society—the solidarity of interests; the lesson that any one problem is a problem for all society and all problems are together but one. We boast that we have broken up the unity of life when we should do penance for it; we look to that achievement as our glory when it is our defeat. A study of the whole question of reform which may lead us to this thought will aid somewhat to understand the variations of reform movements.

Social problems antedate reform. The recognition of the problem, the impulse to meet it, organization underlie all efforts at social reform. It is not strange then that many scholars have tried with varying success to formulate the social question; to reduce to one generalization the estimates of our great modern problem. Before going on with the main thought, a review of some of these attempts will be of service. It is customary for writers to summarize the chief facts of modern industry, to sketch the current ideals of life, to formulate the social question comprehensively, and suggest a comprehensive solution that meets the condition described.

Briefly summarized, the main facts of modern society are these. Its basic element is industrial; its fundamental principle, individualism; its main ambition, material progress; its dominating form, political. The mediæval unity of ideal, organization and law has disintegrated through the force of the principle of individualism which holds that a maximum of liberty for individual initiative is most conducive to progress. In the general individualistic movement of three centuries, religion became a private concern, the state was reduced to narrow limits, the corporate organization of industry vanished. The old ethical and religious ideals were supplanted by the newer industrial ideal; the world became a factory, life a struggle, society a company of producers and consumers. Private property, freedom of enterprise, competitive industry, manufacture for profit, all gave tone and direction to life. Perfect means of communication and transportation have made of the world one market; advance in invention has enabled society to produce in enormous quantities. Industrial activity is, therefore, too vast for the individual. Capital is massed, genius and power are required, great numbers of laborers are gathered. Property and all authority are in the employers' hands. Life is business and business is neither philanthropy nor sentiment nor ethics. Through the pressure of competition, wages are low and insecure, hours of labor are exces-

sive, homes are expensive, rents are high, women and children are forced to work, and the tenement is their refuge. The reaction which has to a great extent corrected these tendencies has not brought to the suffering classes all that they wish. They still regard their condition as one of slavery and misery.

While this condition has developed in industry, democratic institutions have developed in political society. Human rights and dignity are highly rated; ideals are taught, education is to be had for the asking. Somewhere in all of this complex condition is to be found what students call the social question.

Vonscheel, who wrote a lucid study on the theory of the social question in 1871, finds that the problem is in the deep contradiction between economic and political development. In industry we tend towards slavery; in politics, toward freedom and equality. We are educating man to expect more and more, and at the same time, placing them in conditions where they get less and less, relatively at least. Political rights unaccompanied by material comfort are, in the eyes of the suffering, meaningless. The contradiction, consciously realized, has given rise to the whole modern discontent which expresses itself in the social movement. Paulsen in his *Ethics* states that the question is in the dissolution of the social body into two antagonistic classes, with consequent loss of sympathy, understanding and coöperation. Mackenzie in his *Social Philosophy* claims that what is wanted is some principle which will enable us to bring about a more perfect connection between the parts of society; to form new links and ties which will free men from iron laws over which they have no control. Stein in his ponderous work on the social question says that all problems unite finally in the one; in what conditions must the association and coöperation of social groups which are progressive in industry and culture be placed so that the resulting social organization will be in a state of such equilibrium as will bring contentment to all of the members of society. Hitze finds the problem to be in finding a new social organization which will correspond to the modern conditions of production, as, for example, was the case in the middle ages.

These may be taken as typical. In all cases the natural unity of society is assumed, the vital problem is found in the disintegration which we see about us; the solution is in a restoration of unity and the establishment of sympathy, peace and solidarity among men. Such views are based on a large concept of society; and on a historical review of its tendencies. We may reach the same thought by an inverse process; by the study of the individual himself and the discovery of society through him.

The universal fact in human life is want; the universal force, de-

sire ; the universal law, satisfaction. Without want, desire, satisfaction, there is for man no life, activity, power. He begins life as an evolving being, driven by internal necessity to seek objects which give him pleasure, life, development. His earliest wants are physical. After their period of domination, intellectual, moral, social, spiritual needs, aspirations, ambitions are awakened sympathetically and his whole life becomes a process of majestic evolution toward expanded, refined, ennobled existence. As the flowering shrub firmly fixed in the earth, slowly reaches up and out, taking from sunshine, moisture, atmosphere, the elements of growth, expands gradually into trunk, branches, leaves and flowers of surpassing beauty, so man, fixed on earth, by his physical needs, grows, expanding into the spiritual and mental beauty that give him dignity, glory and power. In all of this process, we find new wants, new desires, new capacities appearing, man unfolding into larger life.

Progress lies in multiplication of wants, in improved methods and security in meeting them ; wisdom is in their right control and happiness in their satisfaction. Wants may be real or imaginary, good or bad, temperate or intemperate, well proportioned or badly proportioned ; in any case, all life and all development ; all pleasures and all pain ; all problems and all achievements of society are problems of want, desire and satisfaction. Thus sin and virtue, culture and comfort, ambition and hope, honest work and high endeavor, dishonest work and low endeavor, are varying modifications of this one law. The lazy man has few wants and little eagerness ; the avaricious man compresses and converts future possible wants into actual real needs, and is stimulated to parsimony thereby ; the spendthrift and thriftless have no wants but those of the present and no thought for the needs of to-morrow ; the ambitious man places his wants on a high plane and finds no rest short of their satisfaction.

We see, then, that the wants of men are elastic and more or less under the individual's control. In the midst of plenty, we may expand them ; in scarcity, we suppress them. Men have gone hungry to buy books, endured misery to protect virtue, denied themselves food to buy clothes. We find too that human wants are sensitive, responsive. Circumstances will suggest them ; at once they appear. Once awakened they are with more or less difficulty suppressed. With all of this, our wants show a notable uniformity ; we are inclined to like and dislike substantially the same things. When a gradual uniformity has established itself and any class of men has become accustomed to the same tastes and desires we find that these become fixed, rigid, irresponsive. Certain internal traits in us affect the direction and developments of our wants ; such are for instance rivalry imitation, love of approval, of distinction, of activity. To

want the right things in the right way, and to possess and use them properly is the final best development of an individual life.

The individual thus capable of growth, thus responsive and elastic, lives in society; he is associated with his fellows, modifying, and modified by them. We have now to look for the chief factors that affect an individual life in its evolution in society, for the purpose of coming to a clearer understanding of social problems and reform.

We find everywhere uniformity in men's wants and the ways of satisfying them; men find it convenient to do as others do. The uniformity which results from this fundamental fact is called custom. Custom, therefore, tells us in advance what we shall want, how, when and where we shall want and how we shall satisfy our wants. Customs impose themselves upon the individual, in his physical, mental, moral, social and religious life. Custom fixes clothing, food, language, rest, manner, the arrangement of our homes, and the location of objects in and about them. Our customs in taking food govern us like laws; what we shall eat, when, where and how, are questions answered for us in spite of ourselves. Customs among children, adults, tramps and savages vary greatly, but in each case they affect the whole tenor of life. Had we similarly rigid customs about drink, the whole range of the intemperance problem would be changed, if indeed the problem were not altogether solved. Similarly religious, educational, social, industrial customs give to life the greatest uniformity. The individual is preformed for good, culture and refinement or for evil, just as the character of customs is of one or the other kind.

Gradually the more important interests of society manifest the need of greater security than custom alone would give. Society provides for such by creating institutions which, consequently, are established methods by which certain great social purposes are worked out. Growing out of society, they gradually react and tend to shape society, acquiring a rigidity and power that are important factors in social stability. Sometimes institutions are created by conditions of fact; again they are created by law. State, courts, juries, elections are political institutions; money, credit, private property, capital are industrial institutions; priesthood, public service are religious institutions; teachers, prizes, examinations, degrees are educational institutions. We see at a glance the great influence that institutions necessarily exert on the individual; how his wants, ambitions, opportunities will be shaped, controlled by such institutions as immediately affect him. They give free play to certain tendencies in man, tend to unite men of similar tastes, to create opportunity or hinder it. Actual industrial institutions do not create avarice, commercialism, inhumanity. They draw together

strong men, in whom on account of incentive, opportunity and association these traits come to strong expression.

When society becomes introspective, examines itself, the deeper nature and tendencies of man, seeks a philosophy of life and its relations, it formulates fundamental views of man, his dignity, rights, nature, destiny; teaches and believes these. Thus taught they constitute the chief treasure of a civilization. These views are called principles. They gave animation, tone, even life to their times, since philosophy culminates in its estimate of man, his nature and dignity. They teach what are the legitimate wants of man, the development to which he may aspire, the claim that he has to the opportunity implied; they furnish the standard by which we estimate the success or failure of institutions. The ambitions, hopes, efforts of an epoch in life obey the current principles as quickly and persistently as the needle obeys the magnet. Men, because responsive in their wants, generally fix their conception of life to agree with that conception of life which allows the largest expansion to them. Hence the awful power that has come into the social movement of our time. Men are not fighting to-day primarily for bread and meat. They are fighting for comfort, and in the next generation they will fight for ease and leisure and culture. The whole modern movement is a natural, instinctive, sustained response to the current principles which teach us that men have the right to a larger life than history has yet accorded to them as a whole. In quarrying, we drill deeply through hard rock, pack dynamite, set fuse, cover well to hold the force of explosion down and force it laterally. Thus we loosen enormous quantities of rock. So when we place in the minds of men new ideas about self, rights, dignity and destiny, though, at the same time, existing institutions do not allow room enough for the expansion, we prepare a social explosion which may shatter institutions beyond repair. An idea of this kind once thrown out will not perish; it endures till revolution, peaceful or violent, shall have adjusted life to it. Men's ideas about their own dignity and rights have not the convenient elasticity shown by the genie in the Arabian Nights, which expanded into a cloud and, at the fisherman's request, easily compressed himself into the little box on the seashore. The estimate of man is the test of any philosophy, just as the chance to be that kind of a man is the test of a civilization. Professor Small says well (*American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 3, p. 34): "Men have taken the measure of themselves in the person of more strenuous men. Great men have served to show what is latent in little men. Rare men have explored the possibilities of life for mediocre men, and average life has tended to achieve the fullness and diversity of many exceptional lives. Extraordinary

men have roused desires dormant in the ordinary man, and thus humanity has progressively found itself in its most forceful specimens and in them and their works, the rest of men have learned to know their own nature and power and destiny." When a battle line opens fire, sound and smoke are massed around and about it, while the bullets scarcely heard fly to bring death and maiming to the enemy far distant. It is so with the noise and smoke that surround the teachers of new and soothing views in troubled times. Minds far away in time and space are struck, stirred and roused to the consciousness of new and higher life, new dignity, and there is no rest until the new wants are met by the institutions under which men live. The simile is not out of place, for often enough new ideas have called to arms and battle and bloodshed when wise statesmanship did not hear the demands and grant them. Thus, feeling in lower circles and thought in the higher, meet and draw the world onward, with a power and finality that no known force in history can resist. In last analysis, the whole process is merely that of expanding the conception of life, of learning new wants, feeling new desires and demanding their satisfaction.

Looking over society in a general way, beyond customs, institutions and principles as affecting human wants, we find that society falls into groups or classes. Locality, occupation, education, wealth, descent and many other principles of division exist, so that the mass of men and women are thought of and known as belonging to classes. In such classes we find likemindedness and sympathy; the members like the same things, seek the same things, avoid the same things. Thus the class presents to us a standard within which the wants and desires of the members remain. There is a maximum over which and a minimum under which it is not usual for the members to allow their wants to go. Imitation, fear of disapproval, love of distinction, of popularity force the class members to hold life mainly to the ideal of the class. The effect of this influence on the individual is very great. When these class ideals are simple, healthy and honest, their sustaining and refining power in individual life is immeasurable. They stimulate the nobler wants of life and repress the ignoble with great power. The relation of such ideals to a social question, however, is best seen in the effect of those that are unwise on individual lives. We see reduced families straining, pinching, persecuting themselves to maintain a respectability which they once enjoyed in comfort; ambitious families exerting every power, trying to reach a higher class; husbands resorting to gambling, cheating, breach of trust in order to support a station beyond the means which they can legitimately command; ambitious parents teaching to their children tastes which their talents do not warrant or their means

allow ; done, sometimes with regret and as often without it, because their children must support the station ambitioned by the children with which they associate ; poor families striving for elegance, show, parade in important events in life, as funerals, weddings and school graduations ; borrowing, stealing possibly, neglecting debts, to buy a fine coffin, or beautiful dress or rare flowers. Most of these things seem to be the result of the pressure of a class ideal or tradition, which exerts a power little short of tyranny. Where means permit it all, there may be no harm, but where they do not, tragedy results. Really great men and women escape this influence because they are simple and brave. They seek the substance of things and detest show, knowing how the true values in life are measured. We are told every day that the young men will not marry because the young ladies are too extravagant, or that the young men are so selfish that they spend their salaries for foolish things and cannot afford to marry. All reduces itself in last analysis to a question of wants and of proportion between them and the means at one's command.

Partly coincident with the foregoing and partly distinct from it, we find that our educational system and ideals have great influence on our wants and desires. Over-education and under-education, useless and vicious education, education that clouds, misleads, falsifies the substantial relations of life ; such types there are in society and their effect is very great. Our wants should be educated ; beyond them there is in us nothing to educate ; and yet how little is done. Our chief business in life is to know useful things, know how to love them, seek them, to be eager, wholesouled, simple, never lazy, dishonest or superficial in what we seek and love and do. As long as we confuse schooling and education we shall be in error ; while we call A educated because he knows Greek and Hebrew and Mathematics, and we call B uneducated because he has not gone to college, though he knows pity and sympathy, delights in honest work and simple life, passes his days at a forge and his evenings at home ; as long as society elevates A and ignores B, it is useless to hope for much improvement. Home, church and school are the forces of education in our life. To them we must look for radical correction of such ideals before we can expect to bring about the reforms so much needed. A common understanding of the real values in life and coördinated effort to teach them honestly and make of them forces in lives would be the prophecy of a golden age for society. But even these three centres of education are distracted, out of sympathy ; without a semblance of coöperation for a common end.

The outlines of the wonderful process by which the individual develops are now before us. A creature of unlimited wants, responsive, elastic, he is in contact with his environment at a thousand points

from which subtle influences emanate constantly, tending to shape his whole life. When self-consciousness dawns, the individual finds himself in the habit of striving to satisfy standards and ideals; why, he knows not, yet irresistibly impressed, led, shaped. The influence of environment is therefore incalculable. Were all of our customs, institutions, principles, social ideals, systems of education, animated by one uniform spirit, directed by one controlling thought, working in entire harmony, supporting one another, all wisely coördinated and nobly constructed, it would be all but impossible for man to go wrong, to be vicious, or to be other than wise, kind, noble, humane, upright, spiritual and God-fearing. Individuals might err, but classes, scarcely. This condition would all but eliminate the will from the situation except as far as it harmonized with the irresistible force of such a happy environment. But the reverse is the case. There is neither understanding nor wisdom nor support among these agents; no one feels total responsibility, the action of one is neutralized by that of another with disastrous results for all society and for the individual as well. He is exposed to every kind of influence; tossed here and there; every kind of feeling is stirred at times in the most contradictory way; conditions forcing pursuits that conscience would repel; religion teaching what politics would forget; state neglecting what it should do and home misleading by pitiable neglect of duty. In this distraction of forces that providence certainly made for the gentlest coöperation, man is incalculably weakened. We see strong true homes overcome all of this and send forth into the world, the noblest types of character. We find splendid men and women coming from the most unpromising surroundings; good men becoming evil, and evil becoming good where outer circumstances seem to remain unchanged; we find vulgarity often where we look for refinement, and refinement where we expect but vice.

We are led in our analysis finally to the individual himself. He is supposedly a free agent, in reciprocal relation with environment, yet more or less free, self-determining; a coefficient in producing his own condition. He has power over his wants, exertions, ambitions and pursuits. Men like this or that, do this or that, work or idle time; merit confidence or destroy it, largely through traits for which they may legitimately be blamed. That they save earnings or squander them, be lazy or industrious; drink, carouse and gamble or be temperate and prudent is to some extent a matter of choice, positively or negatively and of intelligence. Young men like city life better than country life. They swarm to the cities, and that simple taste thus causes a series of industrial, social, moral, religious problems of the first magnitude. Girls prefer factory work to domestic service; they go to the factories. The results of the choice

are found in homes, in wages, in morals everywhere. In addition to this element of choice or self-determination as seen in purely social consequences we now meet the whole problem of evil and sin, self-indulgence, disordered appetite, moral perversity. Whether man be his own devil or an evil one "goeth about like a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour," sin is an enduring fact that no social student may ignore. What may be its relation to will, to social causes; in how far sin as we see it is in men as victims rather than as malefactors, we need not say. For present purposes we might make a formal distinction to the effect that evil is one phase of individual choice. We are thus carried through our analysis. All life is reduced to need, desire, satisfaction. The individual's nature—as representing a typical number and kind of wants—is elastic, responsive. The chief sources whence influence comes into individual life and development are the social customs, institutions, principles, class ideals, education, personal choice and evil or sin. Aside from the hundred other forces which play on life, these exercise a determining effect and, for present purposes, they suffice.

A social problem is presented when a class in society has not right wants; when, having them they cannot be satisfied; when its members have immoral wants. Men may have too many or too few wants; either condition presents a problem. A class low in the so-called social scale, unenlightened, apathetic, lazy, careless of everything, presents a most complex social problem. A class with definite culture wants, which are reasonable and opportune, whose wants cannot be satisfied in the circumstances, gives us another distinct problem. A class with abundant means, but bent primarily on self-indulgence and dissipation, nonsense and vice, gives us another problem quite unlike the others. Each condition is the product of distinct forces in some measure and each requires careful methods if we would meet it successfully.

We are accustomed to classify in society according to conditions; the rich, the poor, the laboring class, etc. For purposes of reform it would be far more helpful were we to classify according to causes. Not that a class is distressed, so much as why it is distressed, is the social question. Taking up the chief of our reform movements, we find that they classify themselves fairly well in the analysis here made. Socialism blames the fundamental principle of individualism for our social problems. The basis of society is industrial; our institutions, customs and ideals are therefore shaped by our industrial organization. It is individualistic in principle. All of our problems are created by this condition; they will be solved when we reform industry according to a socialistic principle and renew our ideals, customs and institutions in sympathy. Whatever be the variations

in detail and method among the schools of socialism, all unite in this fundamental view and thus represent a united body of teachers of a reform idea.

The Labor Movement looks less deeply for the causes of present evils. It finds that in principle our social organization is not at fault, but the failure of our institutions to meet new industrial tendencies, dangers and demands, has exposed the weaker laboring class to the tyranny of the stronger employing class. Hence its reform plan contemplates immediately the introduction of legislation, the massing of laborers in unions and the control of wages through organization. In the mind of the labor movement, the social question is twofold: it is first a question of satisfying present legitimate wants which extend beyond mere physical existence and reach into intellectual, moral and social phases of life; secondly, the question is one of raising constantly the standard of life, the quantity and quality of wants and securing their satisfaction. Mr. Gompers speaks in this way on the matter:

"The wage-earners are earnestly striving to obtain a living wage, which, when expended in the most economical manner, shall be sufficient to maintain an average-sized family in a manner consistent with whatever the contemporary local civilization recognizes as indispensable to physical and mental health, or as required by the rational self-respect of human beings. That living wage changes continually, for what constitutes a living wage to-day, may be entirely insufficient a decade hence."

This is to be accomplished by economic action, legislation and agitation. In analysis of conditions the movement stops short of attacking principles and confines itself to gradual conservative modifications of institutions.

The modern state, itself our most powerful and influential social institution, admits that it has a certain reform function. It is committed to the principles of present organization, but admits with more or less reluctance the existence of veils which call for legislative remedies. But it is not primarily interested in reform; it is reluctant to be convinced and it acts doubtfully when convinced. Nevertheless through legislation much reform work has been accomplished.

The average successful man in the world to-day if he give any thought to social problems, is apt to believe—very many do believe—that the social question is an individual question; that choice, will, self-determination is the cause of misery. They minimize the influence of philosophy, of institutions, of social ideals and persistently hold to the theory that the individual who has a wrong to right wants too much, and that his legitimate wants might be securely satisfied if he but willed it and practiced the virtues called for by

common sense. Many instances of the influence of this view may be found mentioned elsewhere in the *Quarterly* (pp. 32-34, Vol. XXIV.). Since men of this type are as a rule high in political, industrial, social and religious life, they exert a great influence on public opinion and materially affect reform work. They do a real service to society in holding to the general conviction, though they do hinder needed reform by exaggerating the view to degrees out of all proportion with reality. Many communications in magazines and books and newspapers on Success, Aim in Life and similar topics teach with practical unanimity that the individual is master of his own fate. Such teaching surely stimulates many, but it is true only in part.

The Church, in its general spiritual doctrine, assumes that the individual is as a rule master of his situation. He must work out his sanctification, and in so doing indirectly meet social questions. By the nature of the case, the Church regards sin and evil as the primary social questions. Avarice, passion, pride, luxury and similar inordinate appetites, due to nature, to social influence, to temptation, resolve themselves finally into courses of conduct over which more or less control might be exercised by the individual. In positive reform activity the Catholic Church in Europe has constructed a coherent theory of reform which distributes causality in the social question to nearly every source of influence described; in part principles, in part institutions, classes, individuals. The one reform which can adequately meet the situation is that which coördinates all of these efforts, works with understanding and sympathy and aims to uplift the individual by purifying the medium in which he expands to Christian manhood.

We find no reform movement occupied with the improvement of our general social customs as they affect social questions; none attempting to correct our class ideals and modify the tyranny which they exert; some activity is seen in the field of education, but the far reaching rôle of education in social problems and reform is not widely recognized. Ruskin's splendid views remain without a following. Education looking to mental development is reforming methods rapidly; as a factor in social reform, its consciousness is but slowly awakening.

Our chief reform movements, thus, seem to be inspired by varying views as to the cause of social problems, their nature, and as to the immediate aim of reform effort. The harm that is occasioned in this way will be seen readily, if we but study for a moment the nature of the individual as he appears in social problems.

Man is one; organically, psychologically one; one in nature, destiny, interest, limitations. Manysided, with powers varied and wonderful; capable of exquisite refinement and of deepest degrada-

tion ; mounting to the infinite in his perception of beauty, truth and goodness, yet capable of total paralysis of all that is high and true and good in him ; with all and throughout all, the individual is one. Ambitions, hopes, volition, conduct, temperament ; what he accepts and what he rejects ; his weakness and his strength, his virtues and his vices are one psychological moral system ; part bolted to part by nature's strong arm, in a unity as enduring as the very mountain. The statesman, shaping the course of an empire, reading a novel, visiting the theatre, attending divine service or playing golf is one ; the same individual, expressing himself now in one way, now in another, but always one. By a figure of speech we say that we lay aside cares when we seek amusement. But we do not in fact. In everything that we do, our whole being comes to expression positively and negatively as truly as that the whole weight of a sphere is centred in the portion of its surface that touches the table on which it rests.

The individual, thus one though manysided, expresses the effect of the interplay of many varied influences in his whole life. His politics, business, amusements, ambitions, methods are not separable parts of a machine ; they are rather inseparable and are what they are because of their relations among themselves in his life. It follows directly that in social questions the whole individual appears. The whole man is in every social question ; to dissect the social man is to kill him. The individual is whole and entire everywhere in social questions, as the soul is whole and entire in every portion of the human body. There is no ethical question that is not related to economics, no political question that is not ethical ; scarcely a social question that is not industrial. Any question is a problem of all society because it is a problem concerning the whole individual. The degradation of a laborer, the sin of an unrepented Magdalen, the tyranny of a sweat shop boss, touches all society, all life. Back of each is the failure of a life, a home, a religion, a nation, a civilization in a widening perspective of awful desolation and defeat. We may not forget it ; each individual is in a sense all society, the whole individual is in every social question.

We are brought by this truth to the further consideration that the proper agent of reform can be only one which takes hold of the whole individual, an agent which sees spiritual, moral, social, industrial, political, intellectual in one glance ; which sees their relations and understands them because it sees and understands the complete nature and destiny of man. Modern society has divided undivided man into religions, politics, business ; into governments and states ; it has thought that problems were isolated conditions and has failed to see that this disintegration is itself our greatest problem. Great men and great thought have always believed in this unity of

life and in the inseparability of its parts. Our economic development is carrying us back to unity and solidarity in fact, in spite of ourselves. Our thinking, particularly the evolutionary thought and the organic concept of society, are directing us back to the idea of unity. Sympathy and interest likewise point back to the old idea, in proof of which we find Mackenzie saying in his *Social Philosophy* (p. 110):

"Probably there was never any time in which men tended to be so unintelligible to each other as they are now on account of the diversity of the objects with which they are engaged, and of the points of view at which they stand. It is for this reason no less than on account of the conflicts into which they are led that men begin to be conscious of a pressing need for the presence of some universal end in the pursuit of which all men may once more become united." A foot note adds: "We are, however, beginning to see glimpses of universal principles by which such differences may be reconciled."

It may not be too much to say that a future not far distant will realize this truth fully and attempt to reorganize society.

Socialism and Christianity, specifically the Catholic Church, are the two powers in society to-day that openly profess and profoundly believe in the total inclusive unity of life, of the individual, of society and which present plans of social reform in which this unity is the directive principle. Both possess a philosophy, an economics, a politics, a science coherent, coördinated, the unfolding of a single thought. Socialism, in tendency, atheistic, terrestrial, external, material; Catholicity, believing in God and His Christ, celestial, internal, spiritual. The two are combatants for the supremacy. We cannot doubt that if an issue ever comes, that the latter must triumph. When the Church possessed universal power, she aimed at universal discipline—an effort "forever admirable," as Ingram says, because it sprang from a noble enthusiasm for humanity. She believes in it to-day. Before modern industry revolutionized life she taught the unity of life, of the individual, of society; the oneness of social problems and the oneness of reform; before modern states discovered the inadequacy of their power, their philosophy, their statesmen, she believed and taught it; before modern economic development began to force the thought on the world again, she taught and believed it; when modern thought shall have discovered this truth, it will find that the old historical Catholic idea and organization are identical with its best thinking and powers. The key to reform is in the truth that the whole individual is the social question and only the control of the whole individual can effect reform.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

Catholic University, Washington.

VERY REV. AUGUSTINE F. HEWIT, C. S. P.

THE five original Paulists were priests dissimilar in cast of mind and temperament. A holy and common purpose was the basis of the unity of their lives. In the days when they were born some of the choicest spiritual traditions of the American Republic came from New England. For the most part this select constituency sprang from the loins of New England stock. Such could be said preëminently of the subject of our study. He had therefore by birth those natural susceptibilities which are conducive to exalted spiritual aspirations. His father, Rev. Nathaniel Hewit, D. D., was religiously-minded and of a strong and masterful type of character. Such manifestations of individuality expressed themselves in the vehemence with which he took hold of public questions. He was a temperance reformer whose utterances were known even in England and who defied public sentiment in those ancient times when rum was both in Connecticut and Massachusetts as palatable a beverage as is milk to the mouths of babes and sucklings. The American origin of the Hewit family reflected back to a minister of the Church of England who was dispossessed because of Puritan tendencies by Archbishop Laud. This was thought to be the cause of his coming to these now United States.

Father Hewit was born November 27, 1820, in Fairfield, a picturesque town near Bridgeport, Conn. He had for his mother Rebecca Hillhouse Hewit, a woman said to be, by those who knew her, lovable, refined and very beautiful in appearance. Remotely her family was of mixed English and Irish blood. There was a religious strain running through her lineage. The Hewit and Hillhouse families originated from the same American colony and the first settler of the latter household was an Irish Presbyterian parson. From this, one would gather that Father Hewit's beginnings had much of the charm and romance of adventure which hover around the brave lives of the American colonists. It is certain that his father, Dr. Hewit, commanded the reverence of the Congregational denomination. His biography makes him out to be a preëminent figure, majestic in form, of serious aspect, whose bearing denoted moral and spiritual composure. He was a graduate of Yale—1808. He finished his theological course at Andover—1814; was made pastor of the Congregational Church of Plattsburgh, N. Y., 1815; was transferred to Fairfield, Conn., 1818; then to Bridgeport, Conn., where he served as a minister for nearly fifty years. In 1862 his work was crowned with the title of Pastor Emeritus. He died in 1869.

The influence of heredity, be it remote or proximate, in the formation of character is always an interesting consideration.

Some time near the year 1828 Dr. Hewit visited England as a representative of the American Temperance Society. He lectured in all the large cities and a record is given of a meeting in Exeter Hall, London. Much is said of his "producing upon all a deep impression of his great power" and his "splendid and fiery eloquence—the outcome of his deep sincerity." These things are told here of the father in order the better to bring to light the characteristics of the son. He inherited something of his father's appreciation of the grave difficulties of the temperance problem and this was more notable since by nature he was never drawn to a sympathetic analysis of popular questions.

Father Hewit had some share of his father's oratorical ability, if that gift is to be measured by the effect of lasting impressions. Likewise in his mother's family were there conditions to predispose the son to study the public spirit. Her father, the Hon. James Hillhouse, became a member of Congress about the year 1791. He was for sixteen years United States Senator from Connecticut. A curious incident is related of him that as President of the Senate he was called upon to be acting President of the United States for one day. The outgoing President retired a day too early and his successor had not been sworn in.

When six years old Father Hewit went to the Fairfield public school; at eight he was sent to the Phillips Academy at Andover; at fifteen his name was entered at Amherst College and he was graduated from that institution in the year 1839. Among his classmates there were some of distinction, such as Bishop Huntingdon, Henry Ward Beecher and the Rev. Richard Storrs, D. D.

After graduation the mind of the youth naturally turned to the religious system which he had received by inheritance. In the Congregational Seminary at East Windsor he fitted himself for the ministry of that denomination. He had acquired the authority to preach and there seems to have been opening out to his intellect, at that early period, the unreasonableness of the doctrinal economy which by right he was professed to teach. The genius and argument of Calvin blighted the fresh imaginings of his youth. Calvinism has destroyed the religious instinct in more souls than one. The mockery and hatred of all things spiritual so vehement in the career of the American Agnostic, Colonel Robert G. Ingersoll, are often referred to the Calvinistic gloom which hung about the perilous adolescent period of his life. The reaction which follows from such a mental condition is always dangerous and sometimes fatal.

Young Hewit escaped without any radical injury, but he never

forgot, as is evidenced by some passages in his writings, the depressing experience of those unhappy times. The memory of them probably provoked in later days the making of that lucid and closely-argued book, "Problems of the Age," which contains as a sequel some "Studies in St. Augustine." Among other motives for the publication of this essay on the illustrious Doctor he says, "We wish to show that neither the saint himself nor the Church of his period held the Calvinistic or Evangelical system and thus remove the misconceptions of both Calvinists and Pelagians."

In Father Hewit's "Memoir of Rev. Francis A. Baker, C. S. P.," there is an account of his meeting with Mr. Dwight Lyman, the intimate friend of Mr. Baker. He writes accordingly that he "felt the charm of his glowing and enthusiastic advocacy of principles which were just beginning to germinate in my own mind." Soon after he met Mr. Baker. In a letter dated Baltimore, April 22, 1843, and written by that gentleman, reference is made to "a Mr. H., a convert to the Episcopal Church and one I believe of great promise. He was a Congregationalist minister, and Rev. Mr. B. read me a letter from him, dated about a month ago, before his coming into the Church, the tone of which was far more Catholic than that of many (alas!) of those who had been partakers of the holy treasures to be found only in her bosom." It may be remarked in passing that Mr. Dwight Lyman afterwards became a Catholic priest of the Archdiocese of Baltimore. He lived a long life as a devoted pastor whose blessings and good works were manifold. His truly Christian death was the natural and graceful ending of a consistent priestly career.

In the early summer of the year 1843 Father Hewit arrived in Baltimore as a candidate for orders in the Episcopal Church. He came to live at Courtlandt street in the house of Dr. Whittingham, the Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Maryland. The reasons which led to this step have been given more or less in Father Hewit's own writings. The more interior growth of his mind and spirit has never been fully revealed to the world. Its most interesting exposition has been found in a long series of correspondence carried on between his father and himself. The relentless attitude of the father and the struggle of the son to harmonize filial respect with the overpowering pressure of his conscience are depicted in these letters in a pathetic manner. He was loyal to the Church of his birth for six years. His defection from it caused his youthful heart many a sorrow. His father did but look upon it as a sin against the light. Prompted by love for his child he could not suppress his wounded feelings. Young Hewit could do nothing but leave his father's house, and like an exile go into a strange land. It likewise blighted a beautiful

and exalted affection which had all the grace and loveliness of romance. But the sacrifices contained in it became, under Providence, the basis of a wider life and larger love. The correspondence between father and son will, let us trust, be published. Its chief merit is the display of the personal element which enters very largely in the process of conversion, a factor which is often overlooked in the study of religious controversy. It is impossible within the limited space of this article to give a thorough representation of Father Hewit's religious development from Evangelicalism to Anglicanism. It became apparent to him that the former, as a system, could not historically justify its position—that its likenesses to the Apostolic Christian Church are but seeming and not real, and that the original reasons for hierarchical organization and sacramentalism can be distinctly proved. In the year 1842 his mind had proceeded another degree toward Catholicism, as is evident from notes, correspondence, and writing done at the time. He began to grasp the idea of tradition and the utter lack of value in Scripture as a basis of faith unless there be a norm of external authority by which to interpret both Scripture and tradition. About this time the Tractarian movement had arisen in England and its influence was beginning to be felt in the Episcopal Church of the United States. The Rev. Clarence E. Walworth has told the story in a genial and interesting book entitled "The Oxford Movement in America." William Rollinson Whittingham, who was Father Hewit's spiritual director, was a disciple of Newman. The Bishop was graduated from the Chelsea Seminary, New York, in 1825. In that institution he was professor of ecclesiastical history for two years. He assumed charge of the Baltimore diocese in 1840. Young Hewit lived with him and was naturally impressed, for beside his devoutness and learning he was one of the most prominent figures in the Episcopal Church in those days. So when the name of Nathaniel Augustus Hewit was presented for ordination to the diaconate he was careful to give his assent to the Thirty-nine Articles only in the sense of "Tract No. 90." However, not long afterwards the Popery charge was hurled against Whittingham. He yielded somewhat by relieving himself of certain ritualistic practices and gave subtle and unreal explanations which distressed the youthful Newmanites that had gathered around him. Although it was a shock to Hewit it was a wholesome one. It taught him to think for himself. He already appreciated the historic force of the patristic argument so logically and eloquently expressed by Newman. But the shock was severer still when news came from England that the great Oxford leader had himself actually entered the Catholic Church. This occurred October 9, 1845, at Littlemore. In Charleston, South Carolina, on

Holy Saturday of the year 1846, Father Hewit proceeded to do likewise. He was now a Catholic. It was then that he changed his name from Nathaniel Augustus to Augustine Francis—in honor of Saint Augustine and Saint Francis de Sales.

It may not be amiss to quote here an unpublished letter written to his father just before this time:

Edenton, February 19, 1846.

My Dear Father: I take my pen this morning to communicate to you a purpose of mine which I fear must unavoidably give you pain, but upon which I trust you will look calmly and quietly. Although it has given me great and most soothing comfort to perceive in your late letters how much your feelings have changed respecting my theological and religious position, yet I have in one sense regretted it, as fearing that you were indulging a hope that in the present divisions in the Episcopal Church, when one set of High-Churchmen have advanced toward the Catholic Church, and another is retreating upon Protestant ground, I might be among the latter class; which hope future events would take from you, and thus occasion a renewal of past sorrow, more painful than if it had been healed.

It is now plain enough that the members of our communion, who have followed the teaching of Dr. Pusey and Mr. Newman, must either retrace their steps or go on into the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church. And as study and meditation during the last three years have confirmed me in Catholic principles, and caused me to advance continually towards Roman doctrine, I find that I must embrace the latter alternative. In justice to Bishop Whittingham I must say and beg you to believe that his influence has retarded my progress towards the Church of Rome more than any which I have felt.

And now, my dear Father, I cannot enter into any minute history of my change, or of my present views. You will yourself see that in respect to the doctrines of Church Authority, Priesthood, the Holy Eucharist, Justification, the Sacraments, I have not essentially changed my views; and also that there is no difference in principle between these and the other doctrines of the Church of Rome. The only new doctrines I have admitted are the authority of the Holy See, Purgatory, the Invocation of Saints and the veneration of images. And these you will perceive I am sure are involved in the doctrine of Unity, of Justification, of human intervention for the forgiveness of sins, and the use of the altar, the cross and other symbols. I have but a few words to say on any of these points at present. Only with regard to images, I will simply say that it is clear to my mind that the sin of idolatry consists in adoring idols instead of the true God: that the prohibition of images and pictures to the Jews was a temporary commandment: that the reason of it was that Christ, the image of God, had not yet been manifested: and that if it is right to make a picture of our Blessed Saviour, it is also right to express the inward sentiment of adoration towards Him which that picture awakens in the mind by an outward act of veneration towards it which we make in token of our worship of Him; just as we kiss the picture of a friend in token of our love to him.

With regard to the Invocation and intercession of the Blessed Mother of God, the Holy Angels and the Saints, it seems to me that it is a necessary consequence of the doctrine that believers are one with Christ and participate in His Righteousness, His Sonship, His Glory, His Kingdom; and are made "to sit together with Him in Heavenly places." As to the alleged tendency of the Catholic belief to draw away the soul from the supreme love and worship of the Father and the Son to an idolatrous worship of creatures, I will only say this, that it is clear from Scripture that all idolaters have their part in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone, and are wholly unable to love or trust in Christ; whereas it is certain that the devotional writings of those who have been the most strenuous advocates of the Catholic doctrine breathe the purest and the profoundest love and faith towards God and the Blessed Saviour. I know from my own experience that this doctrine has no tendency to draw away the heart from Christ, or to obscure His Mediation, His Passion, His Incommunicable Deity; but on the contrary illustrates and confirms and perfects all.

I cannot, of course, expect you to agree with me. My only object is to convince you that as you believe there are pious and good Catholics, you may believe that whatever is true of the Catholic doctrines in themselves, yet as they actually lie in my mind they are consistent with a true and saving faith. And I would for the same purpose request you to read Moehler's Symbolism, a work thought to be equal to Bellarmine, if not superior. It is my intention to join the Catholic Church in Charleston, where I shall

probably remain some time. I trust I need not assure you that my sentiments of love and veneration towards you remain unchanged, and that I hope for the continuance of confidence and kindness on your part which has made our recent correspondence so grateful to us both. I trust you will see in the frank and open manner in which I have written to you a proof of my confidence in the strength of our mutual esteem and affection. I am happy to be able to say that I am quite as well as I have been. You will know how anxious I shall be to hear from you after your receiving this letter, and I will write directly from Charleston. And now with best love to all, I am your affectionate son.
AUGUSTUS.

The successive stages in the history of that spiritual change are more fully shown in articles in the "American Catholic Quarterly Review" and the "Catholic World." The latter has a popular exposition of his conversion in the October number of the year 1887—it is written by himself. In the former he has a very important contribution printed July, 1895. It bears the graphic title: "Pure versus Diluted Catholicism." Indeed from April, 1891, to October, 1896, only one year before his death, he was almost a constant contributor to this review. It would be interesting to count the number and the total pages of articles written for the "American Catholic Quarterly Review" if only to manifest his literary activity and intellectual strength even to the time of his death. The sudden change of scene from Baltimore to Charleston is accounted for from the fact that our subject was constrained to go South, having had several hemorrhages of the lungs. He was obliged to spend the winter in Edenton; he then went to Charleston.

The seriousness of this physical misfortune may have had some part in sealing the act of conversion. On one occasion only was he known to speak of that critical time, and then he told in a most naïve manner of how he arrived in Charleston at Bishop Reynolds' house, thin and pale as death and having but a few cents in his pocket—all the money he possessed in the world. He had, however, that inexplicable freedom and peace of conscience which is concomitant with entire resignation to the Divine will. The Catholic Bishop of the Charleston Diocese was taken with the young man and introduced him to the Vicar-General, Dr. Lynch, who became afterwards the third Bishop of Charleston. He, with Right Rev. Mgr. Corcoran, the famous scholar of Overbrook Seminary, Philadelphia, and for many years the faithful editor of the "American Catholic Quarterly Review," lived at the Bishop's house. Both of these became Hewit's friends. He aided them by teaching in a collegiate academy which owed its existence to the distinguished Bishop England. At the same time he was pursuing his theological course. On the feast of the Annunciation of Our Lady, March 25, 1847, he was ordained priest by Bishop Reynolds. Shortly afterward he was commissioned to compile and edit the works of Bishop England. This took him to Philadelphia, where he met Bishop Kenrick, afterward Archbishop of Baltimore. While in Philadel-

phia he determined to lead a stricter religious life. He began to look toward the "Society of Jesus" and vaguely thought of entering it, but for a reason which could never be learned he reversed his desire. Moreover, his special radical reason for joining the Redemptorists was never made known. Several times he expressed the salutary impression made on him by his first visit to a Redemptorist convent. He was edified by the missionary zeal of the fathers and by the severity and simplicity of their lives. They accepted him after he had passed his probation. He was professed, took the vows and was sent to Baltimore to the Redemptorist Church of St. Alphonsus. Afterwards his Superior sent him on missions throughout the country in company with Fathers Walworth, Hecker, Deshon, and later, Baker. Baker was received into the Catholic Church by Father Hewit in presence of Father Hecker, April 9, 1853, in the city of Baltimore. He was ordained to the priesthood September 21, 1856. The life of a Redemptorist and likewise of a Paulist missionary is depicted in Father Hewit's "Memoir of Father Baker." It is now a familiar story of how the five American Redemptorists, Hewit, Walworth, Baker, and Deshon, under the leadership of Hecker, sought a plan for founding an English-speaking Redemptorist house; and how there arose differences with their Superiors. A summary of their separation from the Redemptorists is given in an admirable chapter of the biography of Father Hecker, written by Father Elliott. It is needless to go into detail. This much is merely intimated to aver that Hewit played an honorable and efficient part in the founding of the new community. Hecker arrived in Rome August 26, 1857, on his errand to the General of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer. On August 29 he was expelled from his community, and on December of the same year he had his first audience with Pius IX. In the following year, March 6, by a decree of the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars, Hecker and his brethren were dispensed from their vows. In 1859, June 19, the corner-stone of the Paulist house was laid. During all this crisis Father Hecker had the undeniable moral support of Father Hewit, and in every detail of the procedure they were of one mind, as were Walworth, Deshon and Baker. From that day to this amicable relations have ever existed between the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer and the Congregation of Saint Paul.

Father Hewit's Paulist life begins with the approval of the Paulist Rule by Archbishop Hughes, July 7, 1858. The Rev. Walter Elliott, C. S. P., has put in print this statement that Father Hewit "was destined to be more to Father Hecker than any other man." This, to the Paulists, was the most providential aspect in Father Hecker's life. Hecker never printed anything without consultation and espe-

cially with Father Hewit. Almost every thought that Hecker placed on paper was not merely the long and careful result of consultation but the effect likewise of interior contemplation, of incessant prayer. It was the natural outcome of the intuitive science of the mystic. There was at times no need to consult the books except to find the consecrated forms from which to clothe his thought and thus save it from misinterpretation. Then it was that Hewit's wide reading and familiarity with the ancient fountains of knowledge and with definitions of the schools and the time-honored scholastic terminology became of immense service to him.

The trust and sense of security manifested by the American Episcopate in relationship with Father Hewit were providential helps in the foundation of the Paulist Congregation. If in his early life his conservatism was unjustifiable it was always fortunate. Latterly he mellowed out and in his search for the true and the right he saw that to accept the new was in many cases but to safeguard the old. He believed and he said publicly and privately that measured by the mind of the Catholic Church, Hecker was undoubtedly endowed with spiritual gifts far beyond the ordinary. He believed absolutely that the consecration of the voluntary principle was the reason of the religious existence of the Paulist community. From the beginning to the day of his death, July 3, 1897, he worked faithfully for it. He was a missionary, lecturer, professor, spiritual director, and Superior General. He wrote valuable books, magazine articles, and reviews. He held converse with the learned and holy, like Orestes Brownson and Bayma the Jesuit. He knew philosophy well and he was wise enough to show that he was ignorant of that modern revelation of philosophy—experimental psychology. He confessed likewise that modern sociology in the department of ethics, although utterly uncongenial to his mind and temperament, was nevertheless of immense worth to science. He knew history, dogma, and ascetic theology. He seems to have had no extraordinary interior experience, but he was holy and he knew how to guide others and to interpret the masters of spiritual literature, as is evident from his book, "Light in Darkness." He never pretended to anything original in what he wrote or lectured; his ambition was but to popularize truths long since hidden from the world. His reading was extensive. Being conversant with at least seven languages, he could at will and with facility betake himself to the original sources of many subjects of knowledge. In a word, his was a dignified, consistent and more than ordinary career both as priest and scholar. May the fair memory of him never go out of the hearts, not only of his own, but of others, for he was a benignant and wise father among many sons.

HENRY E. O'KEEFE, C. S. P.

St. Thomas' College, Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

THE TREATY BETWEEN THE HOLY SEE AND FRANCE
KNOWN AS THE CONCORDAT OF 1801, SINCE
IN FORCE.

1. *Les Quatre Concordats, suivis de considérations sur le gouvernement de l'église en général, et sur l'église de France en particulier, depuis 1515.*

Par M. De Pratt, ancien Archevêque de Malines. Octavo, tomes 1, 2, 3. Paris, 1818, chez F. Bêchet, quai des Augustins, No. 57.

2. *L'Eglise Romaine Et Les Négociations Du Concordat 1801-1814; 1., Mémoires de Consalvi; 2., Papiers inédits. Par le Comte O. D'Haussonville. Revue des Deux Mondes, Mai 1865, pp. 197-233, et seq.*

IN the nominal Republic of France, the thirty-four millions of Catholics who comprise the best elements of her total population, as well as of her social composition; who possess the greater part of her aggregate wealth; who control the commercial, the industrial, and the proprietary interests of her landed domain; which, combined, gives stability to this great nation; are supinely submitting to the infringement of their religious rights and to their privilege to educate their children in the manner they deem best for their future spiritual and social welfare.

This we claim to be the aspect of the present situation, viewed from an American standpoint!

The so called Republic of France of late years, has been ruled by an infidel combination, delegated to legislative power, not by the people of the nation at large, who have been shamefully negligent in exercising the right of suffrage for the nation's welfare; but by the representatives of a *small minority compactly organized*; whose delegates have been the elect of the masonic lodges, which have eliminated the name of God from their convocations; of the organized anarchical, communistic, as well as of other infidel associations existing in Paris, and also in all the manufacturing cities and communities of France; whose political power has been maintained and potently directed by the compact organizations by which they are controlled.

The late high handed campaign against the teaching orders of the Catholic Church, resulting in the forcible dispersion of children and youth attending Catholic schools, is in evidence; while the decree passed on March 24th in the French Legislative Assembly, banishing the members of the religious orders remaining, from France; completes the official outrages inflicted by this infidel government upon the freedom of the religion professed by the great majority of the people of the French nation.

The government victory may have one good effect, by opening the eyes of the bourgeois classes as well as of the indifferent rural populations, and also of the landed gentry, to the fact that their manhood as well as their rights are in danger of being temporarily eclipsed by

the irreligious elements combined in the existing rulership of France. Its consequences bode no good to the present government.

Moreover, these events, deplorable as they may appear to American Catholics, may in their sequel prove providential, by the severing of the bond which for a century or more has officially connected the Church of Rome with the government of France.

The relations of France with the Holy See, from the time of Francis I., in the sixteenth century down to the period of the French Revolution, when religion was ostensibly wiped out, had been regulated by what is termed a *concordat*.

This was an agreement entered into between the Holy See and Francis 1st King of France in 1515, by which the religious affairs of that kingdom were regulated in accordance with the wishes of the reigning Pope Leo X. and his successors. It is known in history as the *concordat* of Francis 1st.

Its acceptance by the respective parliaments of France in 1516-1517, which may be said to have been forced by the persistent efforts of the young monarch, was the virtual abolition of the Pragmatic Sanction. It was not accomplished without scenes of great excitement and against the protests of the most eminent ecclesiastics, as well as of the most renowned of the legists and of the statesmen of France.

The prologue of the announcement by the King of France of the adoption of the *concordat* of 1515 reads as follows:

Concordat between our Holy Father Pope Leo X., and the most Christian King Francis, first of the name.

Francis by the grace of God, King of France, Duke of Milan, Count of Ast and Lord of Genoa, to all who shall read these presents, greeting:

In late years, during the lifetime of King Louis, our father-in-law, of honorable memory, of whose soul may the Lord have in his mercy; the council of Lateran cited this prince several times to its assembly and with him the sovereign courts of the kingdom, which we name parliaments, and besides the Universal Gallican Church and that of our kingdom of Dauphiny; and made known to them, that if they could bring some ancient authority, cite the laws, give some acceptable reasons to prevent by the authority and the sentence of the said council the abolition of the Pragmatic Sanction, abrogated, broken, judged vain, null and schismatical; before the day fixed for the said decrees, then judgment would be rendered accordingly. It was then by the Divine mercy we succeeded to the crown and ascended the throne.

Similar edicts emanating from the same authority were communicated to us, also to our parliaments, to the Gallican church and to all our subjects. By a later edict, peremptory for the cause, all hope to justify our further delay was removed; so that in case we had intended to defer the issue, we should necessarily experience the same evils which befel our kingdom and Dauphiny before the promulgation of the said Pragmatic Sanction. Reflecting upon the shameful disorders prevailing in our domain before this promulgation, when our wealth, which is the strength of empires, had been exhausted thereby, when prelates and priests found themselves deprived of the faculty and the liberty to confer benefices, while a great number of foreigners obtained the priesthood of France; while by apostolic diplomas called expectatives, generally and especially of benefices elective of living occupants of various holdings, were conferred rights of succession available on the demise of such occupants; a practice which was immoral as tending to encourage the wish for the death of others.

Finally contests for these benefices were judged at the Court of Rome and decided against our subjects by default, for it was generally inconvenient, if not impossible, that they could give the time and undergo the expense of personal appearance; in consequence they lost their rights, abandoned their contests, or were obliged to consider them as abandoned. To these were added other annoyances; studious men versed in the liberal arts could not embrace the sacerdotal state, or if they could, they were obliged to renounce the study of letters and to go from city to city, so that as a consequence we were apparently menaced with the loss of the love of letters and the pursuit of scientific study.

Believing it to be our duty to exert every effort to save our kingdom from such misfortunes as were impending, we have deemed it proper to *yield to circumstances, consult our interests according to the occasion, and exchange the evils which threaten us for those of less importance!*

Having come to Bologna with all our court (*suite*) to pay homage to our most Holy Father Leo X., Sovereign Pontiff, homage which we know to have been rendered by the Kings of France, our ancestors and by the first and most illustrious sons of the Church, we have demanded with prayers that he shall absolutely abolish the Pragmatic name, while in its place, with his permission and that of his council, we may seek and invent such laws and conditions, which in its place shall serve as the rules of our Kingdom.

Yielding to our supplication, his Holiness, for he has also at heart the good order and the good administration of the church in our Kingdom, has permitted us without delay to consider and compose such agreements which as for our Kingdom may take the place of the Pragmatic; which confirmed by the consent and authority of the council, with an annulling decree, obtains full force.

The study of this research, his Holiness and ourself have confided to men of great prudence, and these agreements being thus made and confirmed, will nullify the greater part of the pragmatistical articles, such for instance as those of the reservation in particular of the bestowal of benefices, legal proceedings, frustrative appeals, the annulation of the ordinances of Clement, which are called *lettres de la libre et tranquille possession des concubines*, and others which these agreements have either changed or abrogated; unless it may be some interpretations, or some changes which we have deemed proper to make in the interest of public welfare.

As to what concerns elections, we could not obtain the concessions we desired for the reasons detailed at length in the said agreement.

Having obtained from his Holiness a delay of six months to complete all, and having consulted upon this subject with men of great knowledge, learned and familiar with public affairs, to obtain their advice, and because of the difficulties of the times, and that the necessity of circumstances influenced our decision, we have decided that the said agreements shall be promulgated in our Kingdom of France and Dauphiny to replace entirely the Pragmatic.³

It would appear that the young monarch had been governed in these premises by the advice of the highest religious authorities in his Kingdom.

This concordat of 1515, virtually established the union of Church and State in France. The King nominated the Bishops; the Holy See, unless there was impediment, sent the bulls within the six months allowed for investigation, and the prelate was consecrated.

An era of comparative tranquillity in the religious affairs of France ensued; while the relations of the Church in France with the See of Rome, remained cordial, until during the later years of the reign of Louis XIV., when serious trouble arose between this great monarch and the Holy See; this trouble was such that Rome, insisting upon her prerogatives, refused the bulls for the nominations of Bishops to French sees during eleven years. During this long period thirty-five Cathedrals in France were deprived of Bishops, causing great

³ *Les Quatre Concordats. Celui de 1515. Tome I., pp. 244-248. Translation.*

confusion in the religious affairs of France, which was ended by the submission of the monarch.⁴

It was claimed by the advocates of the Pragmatic Sanction that during its supremacy no such disorders in the Church in France occurred. Prelates-elect were consecrated and installed by the Metropolitan and his suffragans without regard to the relations existing with the temporal ruler.

The French Revolution succeeded during the last decades of the eighteenth century. In its vortex perished King Louis XVI., the royal family, the members of the nobility, of heredity and of the robe, as well as the members of the families of the two latter celebrities, without regard to age or sex; all meeting death with the fortitude of martyrs.

The brilliant leaders of the contending revolutionary sections, one after the other, heroically passed to eternity by the descending knife blade of the guillotine; thus ending careers not outrivaled in ancient or modern history. It was a reign of carnage. The religious fabric of France with its temples, its colleges, its seminaries, convents and monasteries, were wiped out of existence; while four billions of francs, comprising the religious, the educational and the charitable foundations, which had been accumulating during previous centuries, were sequestered, diverted from their pious and benevolently intended uses, and converted into the national wealth. France was widowed of her hierarchy, while 40,000 priests, mostly pastors, were separated from their flocks. Then ensued the initial period of the Republic of France, whose obliteration was sought by the existing monarchical powers of Europe by their combined armies.

France organized her defensive legions. The republican soldiers, shabbily clothed, some without shoes, and poorly equipped, were enrolled in regiments and brigades; they presented a sorry appearance, but they were officered by young men of genius, and the army thus constituted, marched to the defense of the frontiers.

Among the young republican officers was Napoleon Bonaparte.

⁴ Pourquoi, comment, et quand les bulles sont refusées. L'institution canonique est soumise à des formes régulières, observées avec beaucoup d'exactitude. Les informations sur la personne et sur l'église à laquelle elle est proposée, sont également réglées par des lois fixes. Le jugement du Pape ne tombe que sur les formes de la nomination, et les qualités extérieures de l'élu, telles que l'âge, la naissance. La nomination du prince (ruler) sert de garantie et de témoignage pour la capacité morale. C'est ce qui explique comment les bulles ont été accordées quelquefois à des hommes dont la conduite n'a pas correspondu à l'honneur de leur état. Un refus de bulles n'aurait pu avoir lieu que dans des cas d'une gravité et d'une notoriété telles que la conscience et l'honneur du Pape lui en eussent fait la loi. *Les Quatre Concordats* par M. Depradt, ancien Archevêque de Malines. Tome I., pp. 320-321.

The frontiers of France were invaded by the respective armies of the empires and kingdoms of Europe.

The allied troops were finely equipped and uniformed; their commissariat was first class, while their cavalry was numerous and well mounted, and their artillery was the finest and most scientifically officered in the world. The French frontiers, as stated, were invaded and occupied by the enemy, but this was as far as they could maintain a foothold on French soil. They were repeatedly defeated and finally forced to abandon the attempt to overcome the Republic.

The French armies became the aggressors and the victors and soon won the respect of the powers opposing the French Republic.

In the meantime the consulary system had, in 1799, become a feature in the government of France, with Napoleon Bonaparte as First Consul, who gradually obtained almost absolute control and became the ruler of the French Republic. He found much to reconstruct, but he established the *Code Napoleon*, which became the law of France and is in general use elsewhere after a century of existence. The young ruler soon saw the necessity for the restoration of religion to the people of France, who had been deprived of an organized church for more than two decades. He was not a man of strong religious proclivities, but he saw the personal advantages which would result, by this restoration, and by the creation of a French hierarchy and priesthood, sanctioned by the Holy See, which he hoped to control to advantage.

He accomplished these objects by negotiating the formation of a commission, whose sessions were held under his auspice in Paris, and from whose deliberations resulted the *concordat* of 1801, between the Holy See and the Republic of France, which has remained in force until the present day.

The official document translated reads as follows:

THE CONCORDAT OF 1801:

Between the Holy See and Napoleon, First Consul of the Republic of France; translated from the text as given by the Abbé de Pradt, in his *Quatre Concordats*. Tome 2, pp. 102 *et seq.*

The Government of the Republic acknowledges that the Roman Catholic and Apostolic Religion is professed by the great majority of the people of France.

His Holiness, in view of the absence of the rites of this religion, feels that its restoration at this time with its great ceremonies, under the auspices of the Consuls of the Republic, will be generally accepted and result to the welfare of the people.

In consequence; in view of these considerations, mutually admitted, alike for the good of religion and of interior tranquillity:

IT IS AGREED:

Article 1. The Roman Catholic and Apostolic Religions shall be freely exercised in France. Its worship shall be free in conformity with such regulations of the police as the Government may deem necessary for public tranquillity.

Article 2. The Holy See in concert with the Government will arrange a new hierarchical fabric for France.

Article 3. His Holiness declares to the titulars of the dioceses of France, that he awaits with firm confidence their acquiescence, and that in the

interests of the welfare, the peace, and the unity of religion, they will make every sacrifice, even to the relinquishment of their sees. After this exhortation, if they refuse this sacrifice, (refusal, however, which His Holiness does not expect), there will be provided new titulars for the government of dioceses as shall be arranged in the following manner:

Article 4. The First Consul of the Republic, during the three months following the publication of the bull of His Holiness, will nominate the Archbishops and Bishops for the newly created sees. His Holiness will confer the canonical institution, according to the forms existing in relation to France, before the change of government.

Article 5. Nominations to sees which may subsequently become vacant, shall also be made by the First Consul; and canonical institution shall be conferred by the Holy See in conformity with the preceding article.

Article 6. The prelates before assuming their functions, shall render direct, to the First Consul, the oath of fidelity customary in times prior to the change of government, in the following terms:

I swear and promise before God upon the holy gospels to render obedience and fidelity to the government established by the constitution of the French Republic. I promise also to have no understanding, to assist at no council, nor to join any league, either within or without, which may be contrary to public tranquility; and if in my jurisdiction it may come to my knowledge that evil designs are meditated to the prejudice of the State, I shall make the same known to the government.

Article 7. Ecclesiastics of the second order shall render a similar oath to the civil authorities designated by the government.

Article 8. The following form of prayer shall be recited at the close of the Divine offices in all the Catholic churches in France:

"Domine, salvam fac rempublicam. Domine, salvos fac consules."

Article 9. The Bishops shall rearrange the circumscription of the parishes of their sees, which shall take effect when ratified by the government.

Article 10. The Bishops shall nominate the curés. Their selections must be of such persons only as shall be acceptable to the government.

Article 11. The Bishops may create chapters in their cathedrals and a seminary for their dioceses, without government assistance: (*Sans que le gouvernement s'oblige à les doter.*)

Article 12. All metropolitan churches, cathedrals, parochial residences or other buildings for religious use, which have not been confiscated, shall be placed at the disposition of the Bishops.

Article 13. His Holiness, for the peace, welfare and happy reestablishment of the Catholic Religion, declares that neither He, nor His successors, shall molest in any way the purchasers of confiscated church property (*les acquéreurs des biens ecclésiastiques aliénés*), and consequently, the possession, and titles to such property and the revenues appertaining thereto, shall remain incommutable in those having juridical titles thereto.

Article 14. The Government assures a proper salary to the Bishops and pastors whose dioceses and parishes shall be included within the rearrangement.

Article 15. The Government will also arrange, that liberal French Catholics may make beneficial foundations in favor of churches.

Article 16. His Holiness acknowledges and concedes to the First Consul of the Republic of France, the same rights and prerogatives exercised by the old Government in its relations with the Holy See.

Article 17. It is mutually agreed between the contracting parties, that in case any of the successors of the present First Consul should not be a Catholic, the rights and prerogatives named in the preceding articles, as well as the nomination of Bishops, shall be regulated, in so far as he may be concerned, by a new convention.

The ratification of these agreements shall be made at Paris within forty days. Paris, the 26, *Messidor*, the ninth year of the Republic of France.

ORGANIC ARTICLES.

Article 1. No bull, brief, rescript, decree, mandate, provision, signature of provision, nor other documents emanating from the Court of Rome, including those relating to personalities; shall be received, printed or otherwise published or circulated, unless authorized by the Government.

Article 2. No individual under the titles of nuncio, legate, vicar or commissary apostolic, or acting under any other title of similar functions, shall, without the same government authorization, exercise on French soil or elsewhere, any function relating to the affairs of the Gallican Church.

Article 3. The decrees of synods outside France, as also those of general councils, shall not be published in France until their scope has been examined by the government, in what relates to the laws, rights and franchises of the French Republic and of which their publication might affect public tranquillity.

Article 4. No national or metropolitan council; no diocesan synod, no deliberative assembly, shall be held without the express permission of the Government.

Article 5. All ecclesiastical functions shall be gratuitous, except such obligations as may be authorized and fixed by regulation.

Article 6. Appeal may be taken to the Council of State in all cases of abuse on the part of superiors and other ecclesiastical persons. Cases of abuse are the usurpation or excess of authority; contravention of the laws and regulations of the Republic; infraction of the rules established by the canons received in France; attempts against the liberties, franchises and customs of the Gallican Church; or any proceeding in the exercise of religious functions, which may compromise the honor of citizens, arbitrarily disturb their consciences, or lower them by oppression or injury or public scandal.

Article 7. Appeal may also be taken before the Council of State of interference with the free exercise of religion, which the laws and regulations guarantee to her ministers.

Article 8. Appeal is competent to all interested, but in default of individual action, it shall be exercised officially by the prefects. The public functionary, ecclesiastic, or the person interested in such appeal, shall address to the Councillor of State charged with the supervision of religious affairs, a detailed statement over his signature, which shall be given immediate attention, which, with the evidence submitted in his report, shall be proceeded with in administrative form, or referred according to the exigency of the case, to the competent authority.

SECTION FIRST.

GENERAL ARRANGEMENTS.

Article 9. The Catholic religion shall be exercised under direction of the Archbishops and Bishops in their dioceses, and under that of the pastors (*curés*) in their parishes.

Article 10. All privileges conferring exemption from episcopal jurisdiction are abolished.

Article 11. Archbishops and Bishops may, with government sanction, establish in their dioceses cathedral chapters and seminaries; all other ecclesiastical establishments are suppressed.

Article 12. Archbishops and Bishops may add to their names the title of citizen or of *monseigneur*. All other qualifications are interdicted.

SECTION 2.

ARCHBISHOPS OR METROPOLITANS.

Article 13. The Archbishops shall consecrate and install their suffragans. In case of impediment or refusal on their part, the oldest bishop in the metropolitan jurisdiction shall perform this ceremony.

Article 14. They shall watch over the maintenance of the faith and of discipline in the dioceses under their metropolitan jurisdiction.

Article 15. They shall take cognizance of reclamations and complaints against the conduct and decisions of their suffragans.

SECTION 3.

BISHOPS, VICAR GENERALS AND SEMINARIANS.

Article 16. Bishops cannot be nominated for sees unless 30 years of age and of French origin.

Article 17. Before forwarding the *acte* of nomination the candidate proposed, is obliged to furnish an attestation of proper deportment and of correct life, made by the Bishop of the diocese in which he had officiated as ecclesiastic. Nominees shall be examined as to their doctrinal capacity and belief before a Bishop and two priests to be named by the First Consul. The result of their examination shall be submitted to the Councillor of State in charge of religious affairs.

Article 18. The priest nominated by the First Consul shall diligently persevere in obtaining the canonical institution of the Holy Father. He shall not perform episcopal functions until the bull of his institution shall have been received and officially certified by the government, and until he has personally made and subscribed to the oath prescribed by the convention made between the Holy See and the Government of France.

This oath shall be made to the First Consul and a *procès verbal* shall be drawn thereof by the Secretary of State.

Article 19. Bishops shall nominate and install pastors (*curés*) and publish their nomination. But he shall not confer upon them canonical institution before their nomination has been sanctioned by the First Consul.

Article 20. Bishops shall reside in their respective dioceses; they cannot absent themselves therefrom without the permission of the First Consul.

Article 21. Each Bishop may nominate two Vicar Generals, and each Archbishop may nominate three; they shall be selected from among the priests having the qualifications requisite for the episcopacy.

Article 22. They shall visit in person each year a portion of their diocese and within five years its entire extent. In case of legitimate impediment the visits may be made by a Vicar General.

Article 23. Those selected for teaching in seminaries, shall subscribe to the declaration made by the clergy of France, in 1682, and published by an edict in the same year. They shall agree to teach the doctrines contained therein; and the Bishops shall send the form of this submission to the Councillor of State in charge of all religious affairs.

Article 24. The Bishops shall report annually to this Councillor of State the names of students in the seminaries intended for the priesthood.

Article 25. They shall ordain no priest who may not be the recipient of an annual and fixed income of 300 francs, who has attained the age of 25 years, and possessed of the qualifications prescribed by the canons recognized in France. The Bishops shall confer no ordinations until their number shall have been submitted to and accepted by the government.

SECTION 4.

PASTORS (CURÉS).

Pastors cannot assume their functions until they have placed in the hands of the prefect, the oath prescribed by the agreement made between the Holy See and the government.

A *procès verbal* shall be drawn up of this *prestation* by the secretary general of the prefecture and duplicate copies delivered.

They shall be installed by the pastor or by the priest designated by the Bishop. They are required to reside in their respective parishes. Pastors (curés), in the exercise of their functions are under the rule of their Bishops.

Assistant priests (*vicaires*) shall exercise their ministry under the supervision of the pastors. They shall be approved by the Bishop and subject to removal by him.

No foreigner can be employed in religious functions, without permission of the government. Functions are forbidden to any ecclesiastic unconnected with a diocese.

A priest cannot leave his diocese to function in another without permission from the Bishop.

SECTION 5.

CATHEDRAL CHAPTERS AND THE GOVERNMENT OF DIOCESES DURING THE VACANCY OF THE SEE.

Archbishops and Bishops, under the faculty given them to create chapters, cannot exercise this function without obtaining the authorization of the government; not only for the establishment proposed, but as to the number and selection of the ecclesiastics intended therefor.

During the vacancy of sees, the metropolitan shall rule; and in his place in case of need, the oldest of his suffragans.

The Vicars General of such dioceses, shall continue to function after the death of the Bishop, to the installation of his successor.

The metropolitans, the cathedral chapters, are required to advise the government without delay when sees become vacant.

Vicar Generals in charge of vacant sees, as well as the Metropolitans and chapters shall sanction no innovation in the usages and customs of these dioceses.

TITLE 3.

DIVINE WORSHIP.

There shall be but one liturgy for all the Catholic churches of France.

No pastor shall authorize special public prayers in his parochial church, unless authorized by his Bishop.

No feast, with the exception of Sunday, shall be established without government permission.

Ecclesiastics during religious ceremonies, may wear the vestments appropriate to their rank; but in no case shall they make use of the episcopal color.

No religious ceremony shall be held outside of Catholic churches in cities where there are churches of other denominations. Nor no church can be used for different creeds. All ecclesiastics shall wear the French costume, and in black. Bishops may add to this dress the pectoral cross and purple hose.

There shall be set apart in the cathedrals and parish churches, a prominent place for such Catholics as hold civil or military positions of distinction.

The Bishop shall arrange with the prefect the manner in which the faithful may be attracted to Divine service by the tolling of bells. Bells cannot be rung for any other purpose without the permission of the local police authorities.

When the government ordains public prayers, the Bishops shall arrange with the prefect and the military commandant, as to the day, the hour, and the manner of observing such ordinances.

1. The preaching of sermons on solemn occasions, and those peculiar to the seasons of Advent and Lent, must be by priests who have been specially authorized by the Bishops therefor.

2. The pastors at the parochial masses shall pray for the welfare of the French Republic, and for the Consuls.

3. No inculcation direct or indirect shall be permitted against the non-Catholic creeds authorized by the State.

4. No announcement shall be made in sermons foreign to the exercise of religion in Catholic churches unless authorized by the government.

The nuptial benediction shall not be bestowed unless proof shall be made of the performance of civil marriage according to law.

Parochial registers shall record only the administration of the sacraments. In no case shall they be made supplementary to the civil registers, which, according to law, records the status of the people of France.

All the *actes* ecclesiastical and religious must ensue according to the equinoxial calendar established by the laws of the Republic.

The days shall be designated by the names given in the calendars of the solstices.

Sundays shall be days of rest for public functionaries.

CIRCUMSCRIPTION OF THE ARCHDIOCESES AND DIOCESES.

SECTION 1.

There shall be in France 10 Archbishops or Metropolitans and 50 Bishops.

The circumscription of the Archdioceses and of the dioceses, shall be arranged according to the following table:

SECTION 2.

THE CIRCUMSCRIPTION OF PARISHES.

There shall be at least one parish in each judicial circuit.

Succursal chapels may be established where necessary.

Each Bishop shall in concert with the prefect, regulate the number and extent of succursal chapels; the plans of this arrangement shall be submitted to the government, but no action can be taken until officially authorized.

No portion of the territory of France shall be erected into parochial territory, without the express authorization of the government.

The priests serving succursal chapels shall be chosen by the Bishops.

SECTION 3.

SALARIES OF MINISTERS.

The salary of Archbishops shall be 15,000 francs.⁵ The salary of Bishops shall be 10,000 francs. *Curés* or parish priests shall be of two classes.

Those of the first class shall receive 1,500 francs. Those of the second class, 1,000 francs. The *Concils généraux* of large districts may, from their local incomes or from their taxes, augment these salaries in cases deemed advisable. The allowances granted by the laws of the Constituent Assembly, shall be deducted from the above named salaries.

The *vicaires* or assistant priests shall be selected from among the priests pensioned in pursuance of the laws of the Constituent Assembly.

The amount of these pensions and the product of their oblations (for intentions, etc.) shall constitute their salaries.

The Bishops shall draw up a scale of the stipends or oblations which priests may be authorized to receive for the administration of the sacraments.

But the form of such regulations as may be arranged by Bishops, may not be published or otherwise carried into effect until after the approval of the government.

Each ecclesiastic in receipt of a pension from the state, may be deprived

⁵ See the "Financial Relations of Church and State in France," by R. R. Elliott, *AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW*. Vol. XVI., No. 61., 1891, pp. 187-199.

thereof, if, without legitimate cause he declines the function to which he may be assigned.

The Councils General of departments are obliged to provide suitable residences for Archbishops and Bishops.

Pastoral residences (*presbytères*) with their surroundings which may not have been confiscated, shall be restored to the *curés*, or pastors and to the priests officiating in the succursal chapels. When these are not available, the Councils General of the communes are authorized to provide suitable residences and grounds.

Endowments intended for the support of priests in the exercise of religion must consist of Government bonds. (*Rentes*)

They may be accepted by the diocesan, Archbishop or Bishop, but they cannot be executed unless authorized by the Government.

Landed property (*immeubles*) other than edifices for pastoral uses and adjoining grounds or gardens, may not be considered as ecclesiastical estate, nor controlled as such by religious functionaries.

SECTION 4.

EDIFICES INTENDED FOR RELIGIOUS USE.

Edifices formerly intended for Catholic religious use, but now under national control, such as a parochial edifice, or a succursal chapel, shall be placed at the disposition of the Bishops by a decree of the *préfet* of the department. A duplicate of such decree shall be sent to the Councillor of State.

Then shall be established organizations, *fabriques* (in dioceses), to supervise the care of churches and the administration of charity.

This is the *concordat* according to the text given by the Abbé de Pradt.*

The negotiating parties in the framing of the *concordat* of 1801

* The Abbé De Pradt, who was formerly Bishop of Poitiers, was in 1808 nominated by Napoleon, Archbishop of Mechlin in Belgium, at the time under French control.

As there was no reason to doubt that he would be canonically instituted by Rome, Bishop De Pradt resigned in due form the see of Poitiers.

The bull of his appointment as Archbishop was in due course issued by the Holy See, with, however, the name of the appointing power omitted, and forwarded to the Minister of religious affairs at Paris, who retained the bull for reference to Napoleon, as he deemed its wording defective, on account of the omission referred to above. But Napoleon at the time was absorbed in his preparations for his invasion of Russia and could not give attention to religious appointments. The Abbé De Pradt, by the events ensuing after the fall of Napoleon, never succeeded to the archiepiscopal mitre; he remained simply Abbé De Pradt. In the meantime he was appointed by Napoleon Ambassador of France to the grand-ducal court of Warsaw. After the return of the Bourbons he devoted himself entirely to literary work.

The published works of the Abbé De Pradt are in part as follows. They are in octavo:

De la culture en France. Paris, 1802.

Congrès de Vienne, Paris, 1815. Tomes 2.

Histoire de l'ambassade dans la grand duché de Varsovie en 1812. Tome 1. Paris, 1816.

Des colonies et de la revolution actuel en Sud Amerique, etc. Tomes 4. Paris, 1816.

Antidote au Congrès de Rastadt. Tome 1. 1816.

Pièces relatives à Saint-Domingo. Tome 1. 1817.

Mélanges sur l'Ordre constitutionnel, etc. 1817.

Les Quatre Concordats. Tomes 3. Paris, 1818.

Parallèle de la puissance Anglais et la Russie relativement à l'Europe. Tome 1. 1823.

L'Europe et l'Amerique en 1821. Tome 1. 1823.

were, the First Consul of the French Republic, Napoleon Bonaparte, and Cardinal Hercule Consalvi, Secretary of State of Pius VII., as the representative of the Holy See, who came to Paris as the papal delegate.

The *pourparlers* were held in Paris.

Napoleon at the time of the accession of Pius VII. had again become the conqueror of Italy. June 5, 1800, before leaving Milan at the head of the French army to give battle to the Austrians under Mélas, he addressed the following allocution to the religious authorities of the latter city:

"I desired to see you all assembled here that I might have the satisfaction to communicate to you my sentiments regarding the Catholic Apostolic and Roman religion. Persuaded that this religion alone can give true happiness to a well-organized community, and strengthen the foundation of a government, I assure you that I shall endeavor to protect it at all times and by every means.

"I regard you as my dear friends; I declare that I shall consider as a disturber of the public peace and enemy of the common welfare, and that I shall punish in the most vigorous and public manner, and if necessary by the death penalty, whosoever shall offer the slightest insult to our common religion, or outrage toward your sacred persons.

"My intention is that the Christian religion, Catholic and Roman, shall be preserved in its entirety; that it shall be publicly exercised fully and completely, and extensively, as also inviolable as it was at the epoch when for the first time I entered these happy regions.

"All the disciplinary changes since made were against my inclinations and judgment.

"Simply the agent of a government who had no regard for the Catholic religion, I could not prevent the disorders encouraged with a design for its destruction. Now that I am clothed with full power, I am determined to make use of every known method to assure and to maintain this religion.

"France, taught by her misfortunes, has finally opened her eyes; she recognizes that the Catholic religion only can prevent disorders and save her from storms, she has recalled her to herself.

"I cannot deny that I have greatly contributed toward this grand result.

"I declare to you that the churches in France have been reopened; that the Catholic religion has resumed its former position and that the people regard with respect the venerable pastors who return to their abandoned flocks, filled with zeal.

"When I shall have audience with the new Pope,⁷ I hope to have the happiness to remove whatever obstacle which may be opposed to the complete reconciliation of France with the head of the Church.

"I shall approve every method which shall make public the principles I maintain, to the end, that they may be understood not only in Italy and in France, but throughout Europe."

One can imagine, remarks the Count de Haussonville, the effect of such words emanating from the lips of one more accustomed to the delivery of brief orders to brave officers upon fields of battle, on the apprehensive priests in their sacristies. The impression created was as immense as the orator himself could wish.⁸

In pursuance of such decided expressions, Napoleon on returning from his brilliant campaign against the Austrian army, ending with his decisive victory over Mélas, escorted by his distinguished staff, repaired to the Cathedral of Milan to witness the blessing of his vic-

⁷ Pius VII.

⁸ Correspondence of the Emperor Napoleon I., Vol. VI., pp. 339, 340, 341, as quoted by D'Haussonville, in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, May, 1865, p. 207.

torious standards, without a thought—as he remarked—as to what the atheists of Paris might think.

“Doubtless,” writes the Count de Haussonville, “in rendering this homage to the Catholic religion it was more to create effect in France than in Italy. As his active imagination preceded the present, his mind was not satisfied with daily occurrences in the accomplishments of his well designed projects. These had their culmination in the future, to accomplish which every obstacle was overcome by methods calculated in advance and never deviated from, whose purpose was personal aggrandisement always!”

The allocution addressed to the clergy of Milan eight days before the great victory won at Marengo over the Austrians, was printed and circulated in great profusion throughout all parts of Piedmont and Lombardy.

It is more than possible that some copies found their way to Rome.

Notwithstanding the agreeable remarks expressed in relation to the new Pontiff, the First Consul had made no overtures in that direction. After the conclusion of the armistice which gave him control of all northern Italy he went a step farther.

Cardinal Martiniana, with whom he had conferred at Verceil, was instructed to communicate to the Holy Father, that the commander of the French army desired to negotiate for the settlement of the religious affairs of France, and in this direction, he asked that Pius VII. would send to Turin Archbishop Spina, whom he had previously known.

“The Pope,” writes Consalvi, “who had deferred action, confiding in Providence, and resigned to eventualities; had not attempted to penetrate the intentions of the conqueror.” Having received with surprise and pleasure this unexpected communication, did not hesitate to respond to a demand which had for its object the reestablishment of religious affairs in France, in which nation the revolutionary spirit had nearly crushed out Christianity; Monseigneur Spina, with instructions to confer and report, was sent to Turin. But Napoleon was no longer there; he had remained but a day and departed by the route of Mont Cenis. Instead of the First Consul, the Archbishop found instructions to proceed immediately to Paris where his presence was awaited. This, under the circumstances, was considered an order.

Cardinal Consalvi had reasons to suspect that the First Consul had had no intention to meet Monseigneur Spina at Turin. But the incident itself was looked upon favorably.

But on the other hand, what a triumph, and what a support for his secret designs, that he could show to the surprised Parisians an envoy of Pope Pius VII. among the numerous assemblages of those

at the Tuilleries soliciting the honor of considering the great affairs of the period.

Napoleon had originated this Italian *ruse*; the Court of Rome understood it as such, and coöperated, because it was its interest to do so; but took the precautionary measure of sending the wise theologian Father Caselli as the companion of Monseigneur Spina.⁹ But Napoleon had reserved for himself the part of solenegotiator, not even making use of the minister of foreign affairs, Prince de Talleyrand, whom he suspected would be inimical to the Church he had forsaken; for form sake, he made as his colleagues, Messieurs Portallis, Cretet, Bigot de Préamenu and the Abbé Bernier, subsequently Bishop of Orleans, who, as *Curé* of Saint-Laud had rendered important services in the pacification of the rebellious peasants in western France. In the meantime M. Cacault, fortunately for the interests of religion, was sent to Rome, as envoy of France to that court. Napoleon's final instructions to this gentleman was, "*never to forget to consider the Pope as having 200,000 men at his orders.*"

M. Cacault venerated the Holy Father, and was the admirer and friend of Cardinal Consalvi. The *pourparlers* at Paris proceeded too slow to satisfy the impatience of the First Consul; the propositions drawn up by Bernier and submitted to Rome had been rejected as inadmissible in the interests of religion by the Holy See. Finally a peremptory order from Napoleon was sent to M. Cacault to leave Rome, if within five days the *concordat* projected at Paris was not accepted by the Pope. The minister of France was at the same time instructed to notify the Holy Father that a longer persistence in such dilatory methods would result in deplorable consequences, *not only for religion but for temporal domination.* To add effect to this last menace, instructions to M. Cacault required him to go to Florence to the headquarters of General Murat, commander in chief of the army of Italy.

The effect upon the papal court upon the reception of these drastic communications may be imagined. The explosion of a bomb in the sanctuary would not have caused more alarm to Pius VII. He had believed he was on the eve of peace, when all of a sudden he beheld war with all its horrors.¹⁰

The news found its way to the revolutionary clubs of Rome and created wild excitement. The minister of France alone retained a cool head amidst the excitement prevailing, and his judicious conduct demonstrated what great service a capable diplomatic agent with courage might render on such an occasion without overstepping the lines of his duty to his government, who had been misguided.

⁹ D'Haussonville, p. 211.

¹⁰ D'Haussonville, p. 216.

M. Cacault, when officially demanding his passports as he had been ordered, did not attempt to persuade Pius VII. to submit to the First Consul. *He knew he was determined to undergo any calamity, even to the loss of his temporal power; of which he had been expressly menaced.*

He implicitly believed that as he had been so brutally directed, the Holy Father could not submit without compromising his personal dignity, and at the same time the cause of the Church. Here, remarks the distinguished narrator, is the ingenious method advised by M. Cacault, which he developed successively to Consalvi and to Pius VII., in sensible terms and original vigor.¹¹

His orders being formal he must leave Rome. No doubt his departure would give the malcontents an opportunity for trouble, perhaps revolution. There was the danger; there was however a method for avoiding it. It is necessary that Cardinal Consalvi should leave for Paris seated in the same carriage which would carry himself to Florence. To see thus journeying together the Secretary of State of His Holiness and the minister of France, the members of the clubs would understand that the two governments were not after all so greatly disunited. The personal action of Consalvi upon the First Consul has become indispensable, for nothing can intimidate as much, said impressively M. Cacault, as the character of this man who never allows himself to be persuaded. His own efforts in this direction have been failures. The amiable and persuasive friend of Pius VII. alone can operate such a miracle.

The course of the Emperor of Austria had opened the eyes of the Pontiff; the former had not hesitated to send his prime minister, Count de Cobenzel, to confer personally with the First Consul.

M. Cacault then said, "he knew enough to promise that nothing would be more flattering to the pride of the ruler of France than to parade before the Parisians a Roman Cardinal, the prime minister of His Holiness. After all, do not become alarmed, he insisted more strenuously at this interview; did he not instruct me to treat with you, as with a ruler commanding 200,000 soldiers? Deprive yourself of Consalvi for some months, he will return to you more able."

As Pius VII. still hesitated: "Holy Father," he continued, "Consalvi must depart with your response. He will manage at Paris under your auspice and power.

"I am fifty years old, I have seen much of public affairs since those of Brittany, which were so difficult to manage. Believe me, something stronger than calm reason prompts one of those instincts which never deceives.

"And after all what is the difference?"

¹¹ Ibid, p. 217.

"You are accused, and you come to the front. What has been said?

"A religious *concordat* is demanded. You bring it; there it is!"

Moved even to tears, Pius VII. decided to send his secretary of state to Paris. It was not without difficulty that Consalvi succeeded in leaving Rome.

As had been agreed, he sat in the carriage with M. Cacault and named himself to the astonished people.

Here, said he to the groups of people assembled at the postal stations along the route, is the minister of France, who travels with me.¹² Arrived at Florence he was cordially received by Murat, commander of the French army, which was looked upon at Rome as a menacing cloud, and which prevented all the cardinals from sleeping in peace. He was assured by Murat that no inimical orders had been received from Paris. This was consoling.

But he could not refrain from considering the perils in store for him at the approaching interview he was to have with the person whom M. Cacault in his familiar conversation described as "*l'homme terrible*." Consalvi had the imprudence to write to his patron Chevalier Acton at Naples a private letter; which letter fell into the hands of the minister of France at that court, in which he gave his impressions with timidity.

"The good of religion requires a victim," he wrote to the minister of King Ferdinand. "I shall see the First Consul. I go to martyrdom; God's will be done!"

M. Cacault became aware of this imprudence of his friend. He had reason to fear, and not without grounds, that it would excite Napoleon against him. He accordingly wrote an unofficial letter to the First Consul from Florence in explanation of the character of the envoy of the Holy See. "He is," he wrote, "a prelate spoiled (*gâté*) with too much adulation, who has never experienced trouble, who knows his Rome by heart and cares very little of anything else.

"Do not humiliate too much Consalvi," he added. "Beware of the part which a man as able as he is, despite his fears, may play; do not draw him into an artifice (*ruse*); meet his virtues with your own. You and he are great, each in their sphere. Finally, finally, if you will, I did not intend to say it, but I must; our Consalvi thinks he is right; while the patriots will swear by him on the four Gospels." M. Cacault could not have written in better terms.¹³

Two ways were open to the First Consul and M. Cacault did well to advise kindness and agreeable treatment for Consalvi, rather than a return to intimidation and menace which had so effectually failed at Rome.

¹² D'Haussonville, p. 217.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 217.

Shall these wise suggestions be heeded? Cardinal Consalvi had traveled rapidly and after reaching Paris proceeded to the modest residence occupied by Monseigneur Spina and Father Casselli. He had hardly been settled in his new quarters when he was called upon by the Abbé Bernier of the consular household. Consalvi requested the Abbé to ascertain when he might be received by the First Consul, and in what costume he should present himself; for prelates at the time did not appear publicly in ecclesiastical garb in Paris.

Shortly after the Abbé Bernier returned and responded that the First Consul would receive him that day at 2 P. M.

As to costume, he might wear as much of the cardinal robes as it was possible. But as this would be contrary to the custom of Rome he went in black, with red stockings, cardinal's cap and red collar.

At the appointed hour he was called upon by the master of ceremonies and conducted to the palace of the Tuilleries. He was left alone for a few minutes in an anteroom and subsequently conducted into an immense hall, filled with guests.

It happened to be the semi-monthly parade day at the Tuilleries; the cardinal, as he relates the incident, was astonished at the richness of the costumes of most of those present and of their great number—which included the senators, consuls, legislative bodies, the dignitaries of the palace, ministers, generals, all public officials and a great crowd of citizens. Cardinal Consalvi was much astonished and momentarily confused.

He was presented by M. de Talleyrand to the First Consul, who, without any further delay addressed the envoy of the Holy See in these words: "*I know the purpose of your journey to France. I wish the conferences to be immediately opened. I allow you five days, and I notify you that if at the expiration of the fifth day, the negotiations are not concluded, you shall return to Rome, understanding that for myself I have taken measures for such a possibility.*" These words were spoken in a cold deliberate manner, and contrary to the advice of M. Cacault. Consalvi was not disconcerted. In the same tone, but in a deferential manner, he replied that in sending his principal minister to Paris, His Holiness showed his interest in the prompt conclusion of a *concordat* with France. So far as he was personally concerned he hoped to see the work concluded in the time desired by the First Consul. The latter satisfied with the response showed his amiable qualities by conversing, and discussing the *concordat*, the Holy See, religion, the present state of the negotiations, and even upon the rejected articles, with vehemence but without anger or harsh language, for more than half an hour before the crowded assembly, and in the same attitude.

The conferences were opened on the morning following the audi-

ence in the modest building which had become the temporary residence of the Cardinal, who had for his assistants Monseigneur Spina and the theologian Caselli.

The Abbé Bernier alone representing the First Consul. At this point M. D'Haussonville calls attention to the detailed and exact history of these negotiations as given by M. Thiers.¹⁴ The Abbé Bernier opened the proceedings by asking Cardinal Consalvi to prepare a written memoir of the reasons which had determined the Holy Father to reject the first form of the *concordat* sent from Paris.

It appears, remarks D'Haussonville, that the first paper in connection with this negotiation emanating from the diplomatic pen of the Cardinal was not a great success.

With rare sagacity the cardinals had caused to be prepared for the Pope his formal order in writing, which before leaving Rome had been given the Cardinal, insisting that in no case the principles which underlied the form of the *concordat* agreed upon in the congregation of Cardinals under the presidency of the Holy Father was to be deviated from. He was authorized to concede certain points, but in no way touching religious maxims.

The difficulty remained to produce such a new form as would be acceptable to the First Consul, as much as was possible, with the exigencies of the Holy See. The Abbé Bernier declared he could make no decision personally, as he was obliged to refer each day's work to the First Consul. Cardinal Consalvi was never permitted to send a courier to Rome, with information or for consultation with the Pope, under the pretence that the conference would end on the following day.

As a matter of fact the conferences lasted twenty-five days. The Secretary of State of His Holiness complained that no effort was made to lessen the bitterness of the negotiations. "The Church," he declared, "had made enormous sacrifices of money, of territory, of prerogatives and of rights; she had besides declined to place in advance in these discussions any temporal object.

Never had Consalvi spoken in her behalf of the recovery of lost provinces, or of reparation for the incalculable evils which the Church had suffered. Nevertheless neither this evident spirit of conciliation, nor of absolute disinterestedness, nor the willingness to give all possible satisfaction, had influenced the First Consul to weaken or relax his first pretensions. Finally he gave Consalvi to understand that if he could not come to an understanding with the Holy See he (Consalvi) might depart.

The First Consul had moreover given to the constitutional bishops and to *les prêtres assermentés*, for whom he had but little esteem,

¹⁴ D'Haussonville, p. 221.

authority to hold a council at that very time at Paris. Consalvi totally ignored this council, although he appreciated the extent of this menace. "He," writes D'Haussonville, "was filled with anxiety and affliction; because for the Holy Father and himself the price of the many sacrifices which had been so great, and the concessions equally great were to result in the total extinction of the schism under the promise given by the First Consul, and the promise the First Consul had made, that if the *concordat* was signed he would abandon the constitutional clergy in the most solemn and authentic manner. Up to that time Consalvi had remained in doubt of his accomplishment of the difficult mission with which he had been charged. Resolved not to vary a line from his instructions, alarmed above all at the imperious tenacity of the First Consul, this impression became strengthened.

But the fact was, the First Consul was more anxious for the successful completion of the negotiations than he would have appear.

It was carrying out the religious policy initiated at Milan; but it was on his part more of statecraft than religion; for, although believing in a Supreme Being, it does not appear that he held any definite belief in the Catholic faith.

Bourienne and La Fayette, with whom he was intimate, the former having been the companion of his youth, were aware of this fact, and moreover they were not blind in regard to his designs. To terminate the negotiations concessions would have to be made to the papal delegate. This was repugnant to the First Consul; but he yielded, in the hope to nullify them by some secret process. This project is disclosed in minute detail by Cardinal Consalvi.

July 13 the First Consul, through the medium of l'Abbé Bernier, intimated to Cardinal Consalvi that all the articles under discussion had been accepted. There remained to be prepared two authentic copies; if these were to be signed by the Cardinal alone on the part of the Holy See, then it was announced by the First Consul that he would designate his brother Joseph Bonaparte to sign on behalf of France. If the Cardinal intended to associate others with himself, then an equal number would be designated on the part of France. Consalvi named Monseigneur Spina and the theologian Caselli. The First Consul appointed the Councilor of State Cretet and l'Abbé Bernier. The signatures were to be exchanged at the residence of Joseph Bonaparte; it will require only fifteen minutes to write six names, and to exchange congratulations, said Bernier, who then handed the Cardinal a copy of the *Moniteur* of the day, calling attention to the paragraph notifying the public of the conclusion of the *concordat* in these terms: "*Cardinal Consalvi has accomplished the object of his visit to Paris.*" The following day, July 14, being

one of the most patriotic festivals of the republic, at a public banquet of three hundred guests, was to be announced the signature of the solemn treaty which restored religion to France.

When assembled to place their signatures to the duplicate copies of the treaty, Bernier produced a copy which he placed before Cardinal Consalvi, who with pen in hand was about to write his name without examination, when glancing over the first words he discovered that the treaty offered was not that which had been agreed upon; on the contrary it contained articles which had not been accepted by the Holy See.

It was modified in several parts besides. It was another and entirely different agreement.

The Cardinal was greatly excited at the discovery and promptly declared he would not affix his signature. Both Joseph Bonaparte and Councilor of State Cretet were innocent of any knowledge of the intended imposition; the Cardinal sought an explanation from Bernier who was *au fait* to the ignoble scheme. He acknowledged in a confused manner the substitution; but, he continued in a hesitating manner, the First Consul had so directed, insisting that it was always privileged to alter a document before it had been signed, besides, upon reflection, he insisted upon these articles because he was dissatisfied with those which had been agreed upon. This proposition was promptly negatived by Cardinal Consalvi with indignation; what wounded him most was the method employed. Again he protested he would never accept the treaty which was decidedly contrary to the wishes of the Pope. The intervention of Joseph Bonaparte succeeded, who, innocent of the prior history and of the later scheme, sought to bring about a timely arrangement which he said was indispensable because of the announcement in the *Moniteur*, and the proclamation of the *concordat* which was to be made at the grand banquet on the following day. "It is not difficult to imagine," he affirmed, "to what extent of indignation and rage such a character as his brother was, who gave way to no opposition, should he appear before the public eye as having published in his own journal false intelligence relating to a subject of so much importance; he begged the Cardinal to attempt at least, and immediately, some arrangement.

Moved by the reasons given by the brother of the First Consul, and charmed with his air of sincerity, he consented to recommence work on condition that the copy of the *concordat* which he himself had brought and not the spurious document presented by l'Abbé Bernier should form the basis of the consultation.

This was agreeable. It was 5 P. M. The discussion was immediately opened. The carriages and servants were retained, because

it was expected that an agreement would be promptly reached. Nevertheless the night was passed without sleep or intermission, while the discussion lasted until the following noon.

The most disagreeable impressions remained upon the mind of Cardinal Consalvi at the conclusion of the nineteen hours debate.¹⁵

At noon nearly all the questions discussed had been agreed upon; one only remained, upon which the Cardinal declared he could not satisfy the First Consul, as to do so would exceed his instructions; but he proposed to omit it and to leave it to the decision of the Pope.

This was agreed to, and toward 1 o'clock Joseph Bonaparte started for the Tuilleries fearing as he said an unfavorable response.

He returned soon, betraying on his face the sadness of his soul.

The First Consul on learning what had passed became violently angry and commenced by tearing into small pieces the pages of the *concordat*. Finally, at the earnest solicitations repeatedly made, he accepted all the articles agreed upon; but in regard to the deferred article he remained irritated and inflexible. Go, said he to his brother, and tell Cardinal Consalvi that he, the First Consul, demanded absolutely the acceptance of the article which had been prepared and submitted by l'Abbé Bernier.

The alternative remained for the Cardinal to accept the article and sign the *concordat*, or break off all negotiation. For it was intended to announce at the grand banquet either the conclusion or the breaking up of the affair.

It had now become late in the afternoon and a few hours only remained between the time when the last summons had been so rudely given and the opening of the sumptuous banquet at which the distressed Secretary of State of His Holiness had been invited to be present.

Neither Joseph Bonaparte, neither the l'Abbé Bernier, nor the Councilor of State Cretet had ceased to urge the responsibility Consalvi would assume in opposing such a man as was the First Consul.

"I experienced a mortal anguish," wrote Consalvi, "but my duty prevailed, and with heaven's aid I did not betray it."

Half an hour later the Cardinal with his two friends reached the Tuilleries. All the vast salons were filled with the same crowds of celebrities seen on the occasion of the first visit of Consalvi to this palace.

During the course of the evening the First Consul, who never lost hope of overcoming opposition from any quarter by intimidation or otherwise, observing Consalvi, accosted him in a loud tone and with an angry visage:

"Well! *Monsieur le Cardinal, vous avez voulu rompre! soit.* I have

¹⁵ D'Haussonville, pp. 227-228.

no use for Rome. I have no use for the Pope. If Henry VIII., who had not the twentieth part of my power, could change the religion of his country, I can do much more. In changing the religion I can change that of nearly all Europe subject to my control. Rome will see the losses she has caused. She will weep over them but there will be no remedy. You can go; it is the best course remaining to be taken by you. Well! you would break, therefore be it as you have wished. When can you go?"

"After dinner, General," replied Cardinal Consalvi in a calm tone.

These few words astounded the First Consul, who looked fixedly at the Cardinal, who taking advantage of his astonishment attempted in an amiable manner to explain how he was not at liberty to overstep his powers, nor to agree to points not in accordance with the maxims of the Holy See.

Pointing out the veritable difficulty, which with Napoleon from the beginning to the end of his career had never ceased to see in religious matters an invincible obstacle, he attempted to explain to this man, who not only comprehended but understood everything, he endeavored to make him admit that there was such a thing as conscience; and that in ecclesiastical affairs one could not do that which in temporal affairs might be done in extreme cases. Besides, he continued, in a gentle tone, it would be unjust to pretend that a rupture had been sought on the side of the Pope, because all the articles had been accepted with the exception of one.

For this one he had asked that the Pope be consulted, while his own commissioners had not rejected this proposition. It is not known what effect this quiet response had upon those surrounding the two persons engaged in this conversation. Upon the First Consul himself it had apparently produced little if any effect. Consalvi repeated that he was not authorized to accept this article. The First Consul insisted that it be accepted entire. "In that case," replied Consalvi, "I will never accept it."

"This is why," declared the First Consul, "that I say you wished a rupture, and I consider the affair as ruptured. Rome will see this and shed tears of blood over the result!" This concluded the conversation. Another effort was made to overcome the decision of Cardinal Consalvi.

The Count de Cobenzel, Minister Plenipotentiary of Austria, was induced to bring his influence to bear upon the Cardinal. He made use of the frightful possibilities of France becoming a Protestant nation, one of the favorite arguments of the First Consul.

This he enlarged upon eloquently, as well as upon its consequences upon Europe generally.¹⁶ In concert with Joseph Bonaparte, he

¹⁶ D'Haussonville, pp. 229-230.

induced the First Consul to grant another conference on the article in dispute, when, if an agreement could not be reached the accord would be broken and the Cardinal might depart. The latter was chagrined to learn that his colleagues were inclined to abandon his side of the controversy.¹⁷ The article in discussion was the first in the *concordat*, which had relation to the public exercise of religion. This latter was accorded, but made subject to police regulations, which appeared plausible in itself; but Cardinal Consalvi would not admit this, unless it was specified that such regulations were for public tranquility. This the First Consul refused as a part of the agreement, because he had his own designs which were revealed later on in the Organic Articles. Much discussion ensued without an agreement. The Cardinal suggested that it was intended to subject the Church to the State. On this account he opposed this pretension. Joseph Bonaparte was perplexed as to the manner in which he should report the situation to the First Consul. "I know my brother sufficiently," he said, "to believe that if consulted in relation to this point he will absolutely refuse to accept the amendment suggested by the Cardinal. The only means remaining to obtain this result, although I do not assure its success in advance, is to place before him the complete articles.

"I desire ardently the conclusion of the *concordat*. We must, however, sign this evening!" As to the indignation which might be manifested by the First Consul, it was he and his brother who were interested. The discussion ended, but the *séance* continued. There were prepared two copies of the articles adopted. It was midnight when this was completed. Joseph Bonaparte in taking leave of the Cardinal assured him that he hoped the affair was concluded and that his brother would not undo it; to this the Cardinal replied that in case of refusal he would not agree to the article pure and simple, and that he would depart whatever might result!

¹⁷ Une statistique administrative de l'époque constate que le culte était rétabli dans 40,000 communes. La conséquence véritablement importante du concordat, c'était la reconstitution, entreprise de compte à demi avec celui qui réédifiait alors toutes choses, de la puissante hiérarchie de l'église catholique. Cette église reconstituée et soldée par lui, allait avoir à se préoccuper désormais beaucoup moins des sentimens de l'opinion publique et beaucoup plus de la volonté de l'état.

A peine la conclusion du concordat, que sur une demande de l'Abbé Bernier le Premier Consul avait prié les évêques constitutionnels de ne pas prolonger le concile qu'il les avait autorisés à tenir. Il fit savoir au ministre de la police, Fouché, "qu'il eût à faire connaître aux journalistes, tant politiques que littéraires, qu'ils devaient abstenir de parler de tout ce que pouvait concerner la religion, ses ministres et ses cultes divers." Correspondence de l'empereur Napoléon, t. vii., p. 215, quoted by D'Haussonville, p. 233, in *L'Eglise Romaine et le Concordat*, *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Mai, 1856.

Victory for Cardinal Consalvi!

The following day Joseph Bonaparte informed the Cardinal that the First Consul *avait été très courroucé de l'article amendé*; that at first he had refused his approval under any consideration; but, yielding to his persistent efforts, and in view of the serious consequences of his refusal, his brother, after considerable reflection, and a continued silence, had accepted the amended text and requested that this decision be made known to the delegate of the Holy See.

Thus was concluded the laborious negotiations of the *concordat*.¹⁷ These had been inaugurated by the First Consul with intimidation, while craftiness was made use of later on. But neither of these methods had been successful in the attempt to acquire the lion's share. He was momentarily satisfied while meditating schemes to recover his lost ground.

Cardinal Consalvi was also satisfied. The public generally joined in this satisfaction. The sensation created in Paris and throughout France was immense, when the fact became known that a treaty had been signed regulating religious affairs, *entre l'homme qui disposait des destinées de la république française et le chef de l'église de Rome*.

The First Consul, during the same decade, was destined to show to the world to what extent he could humiliate the venerable Pius VII. He overthrew his temporal power, sequestered the estates of the Church and finally deprived the helpless Pontiff of his personal liberty.

RICHARD R. ELLIOTT.

Detroit.

 LAND PURCHASE IN IRELAND.

TO THE measure now before Parliament there seems to be no opposition in principle. The number who voted against it in a full House was only twenty-four. Certain amendments are to be proposed in committee, but as they affect details and not the principle, they may be set aside, for probably some agreement concerning them will be arrived at.

While desirous that the Bill will pass, there are some objections that may be offered to the historical survey of its policy presented by the Chief Secretary. These are objections that must be considered with some care, as we think a right estimate of the policy is essential to the successful administration of the measure.

The aim of the Bill, in other words, the policy of the Bill, is to reconcile classes, but if a mistaken estimate of the causes of conflict

be allowed to stand as the justification of the Bill, a feeling of injury will remain, which may prevent the desired fusion of classes. If on the highest authority in the State, that of the Minister in charge of the Bill and of the Minister at the head of the Government, it should go forth that the Landlords were in a manner coerced to accept it, not because it dealt justly with their interests, but because their position would be worse than it had been at any previous stage of the agitation if they refused, it is difficult to discover how they will feel themselves bound to regard their former tenants and the classes that aided them in any other light than as enemies. There are very plain evidences of such a feeling at the Landlords' Convention, held towards the close of April. The gentlemen there had ample means of knowing the situation then. The Chief Secretary had introduced and explained his measure, the National Convention had practically endorsed it; and so they knew the limit of their hopes and fears. There was not in the language of some speakers at the Landlords' Convention a warrant for the future tranquillity looked for; and what is more to the purpose, there seemed even amongst the most collected and sensible of their number a sense that they were forfeiting rights which they had to yield, less something worse should happen.

The Prime Minister in his speech on the second reading attacked the existing laws, and particularly the Act of 1881, as containing the worst elements of peasant proprietorship without a single benefit supposed to be derived from that form of tenure. In this, no doubt, he gave voice to the opinions of the whole body of landlords and the numerous body in England that looked upon them as the English garrison in Ireland. He quite forgot a most important consideration, so far as the Act of 1881 is concerned, that if it constitutes the tenant a proprietor, it does so at least without calling on the landlord to prove his title; if it makes the tenant a proprietor, the landlord incurs no expense of title. There is a material distinction between it and the purchase scheme. In the latter, the first step is the devolution of the title. With regard to the latter, it is a matter of supreme importance to show a clear title, though only one of administration, but then a matter so important when so much of the success depends on the financial element, that the working of the measure depends upon it. There must be a clear title to sell each holding on an estate, and unless the Commission purchase the entire estate, the expense will be prohibitory. After purchase to sell the individual holdings with the clear title they themselves have received would be the obvious course for the Commissioners to pursue, and without a more formal conveyance than would be contained on a page of note paper. The Bill contemplates some such course,

so far as estate groups of holdings; but no one will question the right of individual landlords to select the tenancies they are willing to sell, unless some veiled coercion is intended in the interests of peace. It may very readily happen that a proprietor, for instance, would part with isolated holdings or remote town lands, while anxious to retain his present relations with tenants in the vicinity of his demesne, for whom he and his ancestors entertained kindly feelings. For such a class of isolated or remote holdings—and they are part of almost every estate—there is no provision in the Bill, and the wishes of the landlords and the tenants could not be carried out unless at a prohibitive expense in making out the title.¹ It might be remedied by a simple transfer of the title, the register operating as perpetual evidence of conveyance, the relation of the landlord and tenant within the meaning of the Act of 1881 being taken against all the world as proof of the title of one to sell and the security of the other in buying, as we have suggested partly in the foot-note. No outstanding interest can affect the tenants' interest as such, under the Act of 1881, in our opinion, and therefore the transaction would be conclusive against all interests not appearing on the register. The tenants' interest under that Act has more than the validity of a first mortgage to the effecting of which a clear title was shown, because we rate the tenants' interest as prior to all charges save crown rent.

The security to the state in such cases is the same as for any other tenants who might be purchasers from the Commissioners, and the transaction should be allowed to come within the scope of the Bill unless there are to be plague spots left behind as centres of discontent. In a word, cases of isolated town lands or of individual tenants should be dealt with on the terms accorded to estate groups of tenants. On the other hand, there ought to be no coercion such as that intended to be produced by the extraordinary violation of constitutional principles proposed in those cases when only the majority of tenants on an estate agree to buy. It is conceivable that tenants should prefer to live under the Act of 1881. The assent of the Irish members to the coercion of a single tenant, however unreasonable to outsiders may appear his refusal to become a "peasant proprietor," under Mr. Wyndham's measure to remaining as he now is according to Mr. Balfour a "peasant proprietor" under the Act of 1881, is an assent very distinctly outside their mandate as the phrase goes. We are inclined to think they cannot permit such a blot to remain. We are perfectly certain of the excellence of

¹ We think the tenants' interest under the Act of 1881 should be sufficient proof of his title to buy, and the record of the transaction should be deemed equivalent to a Landed Estates Court, or Land Judges' Title; that is, to a Parliamentary title.

the Act of 1881, despite the unwearied efforts of the landlords and their English supporters to defeat its policy, and we are not disposed to prefer the leap into the dark of unchangeable instalments during nearly seventy years. We have some objections to the Bill before the House, as we may say distinctly, objections resting partly on the supposed history, to which the Chief Secretary treated the country on the introduction of the measure, when he spoke in terms of bewildering enthusiasm of "that old stock which stood the racket of dynastic wars and suffered more than any aristocracy in the world ever suffered;" and objections which a careful examination will show as resting partly on intrinsic weaknesses which, however, can be removed by the requisite machinery for administration and only by that.

The Solicitor General for England, who is an Irishman, and who during the excitement of the war of classes which followed the rejection of the Gladstone measures in 1886, conducted most of the prosecutions under the *Crimes Act* before the various magistrates appointed to try the cases under that Act, ought to be supposed to possess some acquaintance with social and political conditions in Ireland and with the character and effect of land legislation. He declared in a speech at Oxford that the measure before Parliament was not final, and that he would be looking out for the next Bill. The Irish members attribute to this gentleman a malignant hostility to Irish interests which could only be found in a mind tainted by special prejudices. We know the length to which religious, political and social prejudices are carried in Ireland; and we know that instead of being separable as in other countries, they are strands of one cord so magically twisted as not to be unwound, not to be divided but by the sword of Parliamentary reconstruction. It is idle to regard Sir Edward Carson as a man so insane on every subject save what serves his personal ambition, that nothing he says can be regarded as carrying weight. The very objection as to finality he made was one the Chief Secretary himself anticipated at the first reading, and to which he offered in his speech an answer beforehand by no means in the nature of a denial but distinctly of the quality of a plea in extenuation, like a lawyer's speech in mitigation of damages; a plea not possessing in any degree the qualitative effectiveness of a plea in confession and avoidance even. He was simply throwing himself on the mercy of the court. "I am an old offender, so old that I am not likely to be able to offend again, so I promise *to offend* no more." This in substance, and in fact, was the meaning of his deprecation of criticism as though he had forgotten that the first measure in favor of the tenant was the Act of 1870.

Sir Edward Carson, as we may say, must have had good reason for doubting the finality of the measure; he had experience of one "final" measure of his leader in 1890-1891—and we think the Chief Secretary's appeal to his opponents to spare criticism would not have been at all successful were it not that the opposition supported him, we mean the legitimate opposition, led by Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, not the twenty-two members led by Sir Charles Dilke, that wandering star of advanced radicalism, and Mr. Coghill in a combination of reciprocal distrust of anything intended for the benefit of Ireland, rather than a disinterested concern for the pockets of the English taxpayer.

We are quite certain that the English Solicitor General was not moved by a profound sympathy with the English taxpayer. He knew perfectly well, and appreciated what he knew, that the taxpayer in question was found guilty by a Royal Commission mostly composed of the taxpayer's own countrymen and Scotchmen of taking 3,000,000 pounds annually from Ireland in excessive taxation. A sum exclusive of interest, of compound interest, during the period since the Union amounting to a third more than the French indemnity to Germany, and this was transferred as taxes from the poor to the rich country: a sum, so far as we can yet judge, greater than that expended in the South African War, notwithstanding the unpleasant financial legacies bequeathed by the latter; a sum, if to it compound interest were added, would purchase out the English landlords on their present rental, and the English Church Establishment at its present value. Rentals in England have fallen 50 per cent. since the period which corresponds with the rent fixing operations of the Irish Land Act; but this is never taken into account. This statement cannot be contradicted; we have read agricultural returns from every county in England, and they spell ruin for the English farmer. Landlords in that country have voluntarily made reductions greater than those decreed by the Land Commission. One would say the present Bill is a bribe to the new landlords, while they themselves say it is meant to coerce them. The word "bribing" is not courteous, it is not really the word we like to employ, but it was used by their organs with regard to the measure of 1886. There are times when plain words must be used, and surely it is such a time when forgetful of everything in the past, gentlemen pose as if they had been unjustly treated by legislation demanded in the interest of an entire population, when they speak of such legislation as "robbery," "betrayal," "flinging them to the forces of rebellion," and when they say all this was done, in return for their having preserved Ireland to the Empire, and done by the Parliament of the Empire. Under such circumstances it is right to

point out that they have not been unjustly treated, that on the contrary, all the resources of government were at their disposal. Their pretence is that the legislation begun in 1870, and expanded to legitimate results in 1881, has robbed them, made them the paupers they profess to be, as though there were not one mortgage on Irish property. Since the last named year they have been using all methods to obtain concessions of one kind or another, in compensation for the incomes that were reduced or that might be reduced, for this possibility deserves to be borne in mind. Their agitation to obtain compensation began before a single income was touched, and the cry had been kept up by the owners of land whose estates were not yet reached by the investigations of the Land Commission. If it be true that only a sixth or a seventh of the land has fallen within the jurisdiction of the commissioners, and this we understand to be Mr. Balfour's estimate; and if we know that something like half the rental or value of the remaining five-sixths, or six-sevenths cannot fall within the jurisdiction, because these areas are excluded from the Land Acts, we are at a loss to discover how the extraordinary losses spoken of are at all referable to Mr. Gladstone's legislation. It is like crying out before one is hurt, but we shall suggest in explanation with all respect what seems to us to hit the white in the alleged grievance; and possibly the suggestion will be regarded as an instructive episode in the history of Irish landlordisms.

In 1875, and, of course, in the years up to and including 1881, the mortgages on Irish property reached to one hundred and sixty million sterling, an amount far above the value of the land affected by legislation. In 1875 the value of the land had reached the high water mark. In the following year the importation of live stock from America caused a decided depreciation in the value of stock in Ireland and arrested the tendency to increase rents which had been steadily manifesting itself in spite of the Act of 1870. There was a succession of bad seasons from 1876, the effect of which in 1879 was seen in the ruin of small farmers, and losses among the large farmers, and the graziers, which left them with hardly any capital. Thousands of acres of pasture land were surrendered, a thing no one would think possible a few years before. The value of grazing land had been increasing from 1852 to 1875 in a manner hardly conceivable. Wherever a holding partly in tillage fell into the hands of a landlord it was taken by a grazier, the tillage was put a stop to, and the entire holding converted into pasture. Wherever the eye of a grazier fell complacently on an adjoining holding, he offered a higher rent than the tenant could pay. The latter was accordingly compelled to decamp with such compensation as the

chairman in the county court thought fit to award, under the Act of 1870, the new tenant paying it directly for the possession together with the increased rent, or indirectly in the increased rent.

Now there was a check on this adding farms to farms, owing to importation of live stock from America, for pasture in consequence ceased to yield abnormal profits. The year 1879 saw the starting of the Land League, when, as we have said, the utter ruin of the small farmers had brought about a campaign of eviction threatening to bear the proportions of those clearances which had emptied whole baronies of inhabitants in the great epochs of depopulation. The Act of 1881 followed. We do not intend to embarrass ourselves with considerations about the legality of the methods of the Land League. For tenants to hold meetings at which grievances should be expressed and resolutions pointing out remedies should be framed, are constitutional rights. We can conceive that a sub-inspector of police might on a given occasion have made an information before magistrates most unquestionably interested as parties on one side, the information stating that he had reason to believe if a proposed meeting were held, it would provoke a breach of the peace, or at least was calculated to provoke one. He would, possibly, be authorized to prevent the meeting. All this we think is easily intelligible in a country governed as was Ireland. Again a proclamation by the Lord Lieutenant in Council, rightly or wrongly, is supposed in that country to have the authority of an act of Parliament. We think that in *O'Byrne vs. Hartington* higher functionaries were deemed protected against an action for assault justified by such a proclamation. In a country where there is no public opinion, where officials of all classes are led to consider themselves not merely the guardians of the law, but are in their own persons above or outside of the law, when acting under the authority of a proclamation, it might be conceived that a proclamation of the Lord Lieutenant and Privy Council—without an act of Parliament at all—could suspend the right of public meeting. Throwing out these possibilities a fair-minded person could reasonably infer that public discontents, in themselves, perfectly justifiable, would be forced below the surface; and we fear that this it is that led to many of the secret societies that kept the country in unrest.

There were discontents in the sister island from time to time. Exclusion from the franchise of a large part of the English people was one; the right to send one, or even two members to Parliament possessed by some paltry village at a great man's gate, was one; the inability of towns of the first commercial importance to send a single representative to Parliament was one. There is hardly any one now we

think who would openly defend what was called "The Peterloo massacre." We doubt would Mr. Coghill, and we are very sure that Sir Charles Dilke would not defend the riding down of Englishmen assembled to pass resolutions in favor of a reform in the representation of the people. Still, we do not say the meetings of the Land League were improperly suppressed, but we cannot prevent the mind from going back to the figure of "the old man eloquent," whose greatness in all things made for him a zone into which petty interests and political malignities could not find their way, and who was so much affected by one of the incidents attending interference with a public meeting, in a little Irish country town, that he gave as a battle cry to every Englishman who loved justice and hated oppression: "Remember Mitchelson!" That cry is a thing of the past; in the era of sweet reasonableness, into which all classes, save a few stalwart landlords, have entered, the episode may be put out of sight like many another memory, but the indignation of the great Liberal Chief should never be forgotten by those he so often led to victory over the powers of violence and fraud.

But whatever may have been the character of the Land League meetings, the Act of 1881 is the law of the land, and must be the law for a large part of the agricultural interests in Ireland, while the administration of the coming measure is moving from estate to estate with leaden steps, and ought to be spoken of with respect by those charged with the responsibilities of government. The crime which attaints that great measure is that it exposed a hideous and gigantic pretense, a public lie; the pretense of an aggregate of bankrupts posing as an aristocracy of great wealth and great public spirit. If they had not been living on credit and on artificial margins of rental, how could the passing of an act have affected them before one sub-commission could sit under it? How could it have affected those whom the court had not reached, or those who were not likely to be reached for years? How could it have affected incomes on estates wholly or almost wholly outside its purview? Yet, all the landlords joined to assail it, all the land owners, all the agents, all the hangers on of the landed interest attacked it as the spoliation of the loyal few who had been fighting their "corner," as the chief Secretary would phrase it, holding Ireland for England in the teeth of the sullen and refractory population that their fathers conquered. Why, so full of this sense of peculiar cohesion in its units revolving in the midst of storm clouds is this ascendancy, that we remember well a man of a most beloved private character, Lord Rathmore, declaiming to the Dublin Tories that they were once more face to face with that foe their fathers had overthrown two hundred years ago, and this with regard to an institution condemned

by all parties. The fierce undying feeling of class and party superiority is not confined to men of the rank of the gentlemen just named, the Belfast ship carpenter and Lurgan weaver can dream when things are flourishing that all around is moving to prosperity, that is, to the beneficent conditions of life to be attained when 'he "Papishes" are again under their feet. Why, even in England it was said that the harmony in Ireland produced by the conference of landlords and tenants was a sham treaty of peace for the purpose of throwing dust in the eyes of the British tax-payers.

Men who have money to lend—and these have done strange things for high interest—they have lent to Turkey, to the Republics of South America, to the Khedive when his bonds were not worth the paper on which the obligations were written—such men expect some sort of return. When economic forces, quite apart from the Act of 1881, pricked the bubble of the solvency of Irish landlords, no money would be lent even by the most rash. The office in Henrietta Street would tell any money lenders' attorney what the amount of mortgages affecting an estate reached, all persons interested in this information would soon learn that they had been lending money to men, the value of whose Equity of Redemption was not even a metaphysical subtlety of ownership.

Looking at the facts as they are presented, any one will recognize that the claims of the Irish landlords to compensation for losses synchronizing with the fall of agricultural values in England have no foundation in justice. Certainly legislation after the mortgages were made did not make them debtors. If their claims are at all good, it is against their creditors they are good, and not against the legislature. Now, let us be understood, as we shall have to give from our point of view some presentation of this branch of the Irish difficulty; we are anxious to state the matter fairly; we do not mean anything uncivil when we say that any title to relief the landlords have is against their creditors who must have lent much of the money on fancy rentals. That is, in the sense of protection against men, who, in eagerness to obtain speculative interest, tempted them to borrow on rents screwed up to the point the lands could not bear. The idea that mortgages possess a character, which in the absence of special equities, they have no more right to than any other kind of debt, is one that we think ought to be done away with. We do not mean to suggest the abolition of specialties, but we desire to get rid of the fetish worship of things in any way connected with the land, so that even charges on land are different to other debts. It is not asked for here that there shall be a universal leveling of debts, but we suggest the leveling of debts in their own classes affecting the estates of Irish landlords. Any one who

knows Ireland knows perfectly well that the landlords are largely indebted in simple contract debts, but there is no account of these, in the controversy, because they die with tenants for life. Neither is it supposed that these will be paid unless, possibly, in exceptional instances where the next tenant in tail makes himself liable for the debts of the tenant for life, a thing we are glad to say has happened to our knowledge.

What we think is that mortgages should lose priority as between themselves and judgment mortgages should level with the simple contract debts. Then that a composition of so much in the pound should be paid in each class, a higher one in the first than in the second. The pretence that these gentlemen are persons of exceptional virtue and honesty had better be shelved for the present. It is not relevant to the issue. We venture to say that large numbers of the landlords are in the books of shopkeepers, and that these landlords became indebted to their tenants. That many are indebted to money-lenders on promissory notes, possibly with the collateral security of life assurance we have every reason to believe. We think there is a reported case of this kind, in which we appeared before the late Judge Flanagan of the Landed Estates Court. The circumstances were peculiar, but we succeeded in postponing over forty judgment mortgages to the right of the owner's wife, to step into the shoes of a mortgagee whose debt she had paid off. Clearly this gentleman's interest had been mortgaged to the hilt, and was of no value, but the money lenders had gratified him at a high rate of interest, in the hope of getting paid in full, in some way ordinary people cannot conceive. When the estate came into the market for debts against the inheritance contracted by husband and wife jointly, a principal mortgage was paid off by the wife out of her own separate estate. In consequence of this the Israelites rushed in to secure priority over her, which, as we have said, would have turned highly speculative debts into certainties; that is to say, moneys lent to a man no better than a pauper. The case is ear-marked on account of certain legal-equitable principles involved, but it is material as showing how ready money lenders were in those earlier days to lend money, even when the risk was extreme. We could not have been more than a year at the Bar when we were asked for opinion on behalf of two tenants concerning four promissory notes amounting in all to £2,000, two of these passed by a great landlord, a peer of the realm, who was a tenant for life under his own marriage settlement, and one each by his younger brothers. There was the general settlement under which the three were tenants in tail, and the two particular settlements, by which the peer and a younger brother were tenants for life. Only one promissory note could affect the

inheritance by means of a judgment registered and this with regard to the remote interest of the one younger brother, who was a tenant in tail and who had not been made a tenant for life under a settlement like those executed on the marriage of his brothers. But the strange thing now comes to be stated,—the two younger brothers had considerable incomes of their own, partly from small fee simple estates, and partly from valuable leaseholds of pasture farms. These were not included in any settlement. The obvious course was to procure a judgment against each of the younger brothers, and register against the unsettled estates. The debts were about being barred by the Statute of Limitations. The tenants, a father and son, each with his own holdings, dreaded to take proceedings, losing thereby £2,000 and interest, after going to the expense of having their attorney send a case for advice to counsel. All that a landlord or an agent need do in those days was to borrow money on his I. O. U. or better for the tenant, on his promissory note, as the tenant could obtain Bank accommodation on the Document; but a field here, a little farm there, a building plot in the village or the hope of any of these favors was after all the chief consideration for the loan. There was the other side of the medal, if the loan were refused, notice to quit, eviction, ruin would follow or might follow. It was slavery pure and simple. In this way “that old stock” “fought their corner,” “suffered more than any aristocracy,” to quote the Chief Secretary’s words, but not in his application of them.

We are writing this largely from personal experience and we deem it our duty to do so since we find that most, if not all, of those who have dealt with the question of Irish land since Mr. Wyndham’s measure was spoken of have acted similarly. Even a philosophical lawyer has given his personal knowledge of cases in Ireland under the act of 1870 and the Act of 1880, in the *Nineteenth Century* for April. This gentleman, Sir Alexander Miller, instead of keeping to those transcendental propositions which, like prophecies cannot be controverted, has descended to the arena of law and legislation; but he has not offered the light we might look for from a man of his distinction. Whenever he was accurate, he was not speaking to a single point in issue; when relevant he was inaccurate.

Judge O’Connor Morris had been airing his views in the *Times*, in at least one English weekly, in the magazines as well as in his county court, on the existing law as reasons in opposition to further legislation. We are not insensible of the impropriety of a judge railing at the law he has to administer. We think such a thing indefensible when done for a political purpose. Whether he does

so in a daily paper, a weekly or monthly, or even in his own court, there can be no conceivable justification for it. There has been too much of this in Ireland; it invaded even the Land Judges Court in Chancery. A judicial pronouncement expressed with dignity concerning the operation of an Act in a case in which the law works injustice in a particular case then and there, is one thing; but light and quasi-jocular criticisms and sarcasms on the general scope of a law, without reference to the matter before the court, varied by sneers at public men and suggestions as to the dishonesty of the influences that caused the passing of the particular law is another. We find it difficult to understand how the people can be expected to respect the law, generally, when a particular statute affecting a wide field of interests is discredited by the judges who have to interpret and administer it. This pernicious example was followed in certain parts of the country. Examining the judgments of the Sub-Commission Courts, even when the Government which passed the Act of 1881 was in power, was common; when their opponents took their place, to show contempt for the sub-Commissioners almost everywhere was the practice of landlords to an incredible extent and of tenants leaders to a very censurable extent.

There is one very strong recommendation the Bill possesses; it proposes to preserve the Gentry, that is, it offers an inducement to them to remain in their own country. Many objections would occur to the expropriation of the class altogether. We think no Irishman desires it. The most obvious certainly would be the injustice of requiring them to sell the land in their own immediate possession, unless the supreme interest of the state required it. We do not know that this was intended by the Gladstone Bill of 1886, we rather think it had no such intention; that what Mr. Gladstone really meant was, if these gentlemen found they could not live in the same country as a Home Rule Parliament, the sale of their estates through the Treasury to their tenants, would provide the means to enable them to leave it. It was very likely he possessed information leading him to think there would be a general stampede of the aristocracy. We ourselves heard men speaking in that strain. The moment Home Rule is passed, the Catholic Anti-Home Ruler would say, "I'll pack my portmanteau;" and indeed one gentleman would have a good reason for doing so in any case. As a trustee, he simply squandered the trust estate as though it were his own. The Protestant would declare if Home Rule or Rome Rule were forced down "our throats!" These were mere threats, idle movements of the air not meaning anything, dying in the sound, but no doubt such utterances were carried to Mr. Gladstone. The Protestants had as much intention of leaving the

country as the Catholics, unless indeed, when both had interests in England which made it really their country.

We are, as we cannot too often insist, anxious that the Bill may be successful. We do not mean that it will pass, this is outside doubt—but we hope that its administration may confer that character of finality which Sir Edward Carson thinks it wants, which the Chief Secretary seems to fear it wants, and which without such administration it must want.

The first practical thing in addition to what we have suggested in the way of amendments, is to compel all absentees to sell to their tenants. Absenteeism is an ancient and universally condemned mischief in the social system of Ireland. The measure does not deal with it. What interest has the Duke of Abercorn, the chairman of the Landlords' Convention in Ireland? He has sold the greater part of his Irish estates and invested the proceeds in Mr. Rhodes' Chartered Company and other African enterprises. He is an Irish Duke and Marquis, we think; at all events we know he is an Irish peer, but a title from Ireland does not necessarily mean an estate there, or any connection with the country. Under George I. and George II. it was a common thing to elevate the women who came with them from Hanover to the distinction of peeresses of the Kingdom of Ireland in their own right, and to reward the men from that country, whose proper place was Newgate or the Fleet, or some convict settlement, with an Irish Peerage.² This was what Grattan meant when he told the Commons of Ireland that England had dishonored their peerage. The Duke of Abercorn is a most respectable man, as his father before him was, but his principal, if not at all his financial interest, is situated in the Rand, in South African mines, helping in the eminently Christian business of compelling black men to go down from Central Africa to Johannesburg and die below the surface of the earth in labor and conditions of living necessarily fatal to persons of their habits and whose existence has been spent in the open air. We are not condemning the noble Duke for believing as his fellow shareholders of Jewry and Germany believe, that it is good the blacks should be civilized by transportation to a climate different from their native one, and introduced to a form of Christianity not incompatible with polygamy, by forced labor as a preparation for the mysteries hidden below the mines, and to which that labor will be a speedy passport. But Irishmen who were called tenants used to be transported in

² The infamous men and women in the train of these princes obtained pensions on the Irish Establishment, because even Walpole dared not put them in that of England, and were created Irish Earls and Countesses because it would bring about a revolution if they obtained such titles in England.

former days to American and Australian convict stations, used to be evicted, used to be starved to death, in recent days, that the Noble Duke and men like him might buy shares in South African enterprises, or in order that the lesser landlords might run up £160,000,000 in mortgages, and as much more in unsecured debts.

One objection to purchases through the Imperial Exchequer is that the drain of money from the country is a loss for which there can be no equivalent. Rents paid to resident landlords come back in some degree even though a large part went away to English capitalists as interest on mortgages. The reader may not be aware, but it is a fact, that a very large part of Irish mortgages are held by English insurance companies. Very many other mortgagees, who made advances in Irish property there were besides the shareholders of such enterprises. As to the existing transactions, we are not in a position to say exactly to what extent the securities are held by Englishmen; but this we are sure of, there is an enormous English interest in Irish landed property and this must be respected by the government as a political expediency. But is Parliament bound to be so tender about speculators, such as the government considers itself to be? We know that the metropolitan district sends nearly seventy members to the House of Commons. This is a formidable power when the conditions are considered. They can always be on the spot; they are by their numbers and the fact of vicinity, more consolidated than the other sections of the House. They are far more homogeneous than the Liberal party when a matter touches the pocket of London, more influential than Ireland and Scotland combined, unless the members from these countries are prepared to incur special sacrifices of time, health and comfort to attend—a sacrifice not to be expected unless on very rare occasions. We do not think the suggestion we make with regard to absentees will produce any effect, but we make it for more reasons than one. We think, at least, it should be discussed, for it is these English mortgagees who are to be secured by the great price to be paid by the Irish tenant purchasers, and with them, the absentee landlords who drain the country of its resources.

But first, we have suggested that there shall be no distinction between individual tenants or the tenants of outlying town lands and the estate groups contemplated by the Bill; second, that there shall be no coercion of the tenants to buy, and in this we would include not crippling the machinery of the Land Commission to fix fair rents;³ third, that a register of the title in the case of isolated hold-

³ The savings expected from reducing the strength of the Land Commission is part of the security for the advances from the Exchequer. The change should not be allowed to impair its efficiency.

ings would serve every purpose of a conveyance; that is, that on the register clearly nothing should appear except the transfer of the owner's title to the purchaser,—the owner appearing as absolute owner, and the title not affected by equitable estates. Such a reform as this would produce a great saving in the administration of the Bill if adopted for all the transactions coming within its scope. With regard to this matter, we offer one more word: In case of sale after the sixty-eight and one-half years for repayment by permission of the ruling authority,⁴ a registration of the transaction as between vendor and purchaser would be sufficient per se to convey the interest—the old transaction and the landlord's name disappearing of course—but we think that a copy of the entry on the register simply handed to the purchaser, should be held conclusive evidence to the world that he was thenceforth the owner; fourth, that there should be an abatement of all mortgages without regard to priority, that is that these should be cut down to the same amount in the £1, to be paid on foot of them, all other debtors to be compelled to accept a smaller composition on their debts, but the same percentage on them as between themselves;⁵ fifth, the compulsory sale of absentee's estates, even on the liberal terms of the Bill; sixth, an executive responsible to a parliament in Ireland for collecting the instalments and remitting them to the Imperial Exchequer. Without such an executive the administration of the measure is foredoomed to failure. This, however, is too important a question to be left without full discussion.

These points are all of interest and importance, but of different degrees of both. For instance, the last matter mentioned opens up the whole question of government by Boards which has been the bane of Ireland. Taking up the question of requiring mortgages to abate—a question which goes to the root of the financial propositions of the Bill—it strikes one at the first blush that this is a serious violation of the rights of contract; that the mortgagees are entitled to sit on their securities, as the saying is, no matter what may happen to the landlords is, of course, the fact. But to this the answer is twofold. Of course they are entitled to rely on their securities in a normal condition of affairs, just as all classes of debtors have a right to be paid in full; but first, the land which is their primary security has been depreciated in value—indeed they look upon it as their sole security—and it is at least conceivable that

⁴ We assume such permission will be required, as the ruling authority preserves a perpetual interest to the extent of one-eighth of the value of the holding.

⁵ For instance, a composition of fifty per cent. for all mortgages and of twenty-five per cent. for all other debts. Annuities and other charges on the inheritance to rank as mortgages to strangers.

it may become still further depreciated until it affords no security whatever. A composition in such a case would only be a parallel to the settlement of an arranging trader under the Court of Bankruptcy. We are speaking now of the effect of competition from outside producing an effect on the mortgagee's security similar to the unexpected rivalry which would prevent an honest trader paying 20 shillings to the £1. In this the tenant is no factor at all. The fair rent toties quoties ad infinitum conceivably reducible is the bone of contention between the mortgagees and the mortgagor, that is all that mortgagees and mortgagor can look at. But the contract between the mortgagees themselves and the owner is already seriously affected by priorities; so that although the owner has contracted to pay all present incumbrances in full, he cannot fulfil his contract with all of them because the puisne incumbrancers will not be reached; so what then becomes of the sacred immutability of contracts? Even priority itself is a mere convention as the doctrine of "tacking" would show. We want to present in this most important social and political question a proposition that can hardly be disputed, namely, that a prior incumbrancer must not be regarded as essentially possessing a better title in conscience to be paid in full than a junior one, any more than a simple contract creditor of four years' standing has a preferential title to one of one year's standing. We are not concerned with the wording of the application of our principle; it is enough that it be reasonable in the present instance. We say there is no distinction in essence between mortgages and simple contract debts. They are all debts; so that any preference that one has above the other is due to artificial conventions, which must give way when circumstances of public policy require it. What the Chief Secretary's Bill is really doing is to provide payment in full to a particular class of creditors, who have no special equities, say such as salvage creditors, but who advanced their money to men notoriously extravagant; and in addition to make a bankrupt owner a solvent man at the expense of the tenants, the financial security of Ireland, and through the credit of the empire at large. This view has not been presented by any one of the able critics who have discussed the question of the proposed change in the tenure of Irish land. In trade, debts are lost every day, and no one seems to think such losses ground for compensation through the instrumentality of Acts of Parliament. When drawn out in this way, the immunity from all the accidents affecting the life of man, and the interest of nations demanded on behalf of one or two senior encumbrancers, seems to be founded on a superstition not tolerable to an enlightened age. It altogether arises from habits of thought under the dominion of which people suppose there is something peculiarly

sacred in landed property. We shall say a word about this sacrosanct entity from a purely legal as distinguished from an economic point of view, although the latter has irresistible force when properly stated.

The meaning of all this is that the ownership of land is the safeguard for the existence of an aristocracy. This in the last analysis is the foundation for the inviolable sanctity of debts secured on the inheritance, just as though they in some manner partook of the nobility of the great Barons, for whom property in land was appropriated from the public. To provide that land shall descend to the latest generations of an owner is the persistent idea that there shall be a class superior to all other classes, separated from all others by a dominion over a natural agent on which the existence of all other classes depends. From this influence, no one escapes. It may be that the Radical thinks that the power of individuals to control the distribution, because they control the production of the means of life should not be left in their hands, but he bows before the great man of the place.⁶

Even the difficulties attending the sale of land contribute to its possession by a comparatively small number of persons; and this creation of a monopoly is naturally said to be a great restraint on production, and this by the economists who speak of such men with praise as the ideal farmers when they employ capital in that industry. That the splitting up of great properties will come about by natural causes in England is inevitable; and this is only another way of saying that great properties are a restraint on production. What has been done, and what is about to be done, in Ireland is nothing more than the anticipation of the change to take place in England, unless, indeed, land owners desire a bloody revolution,⁷ an anticipation due to the different conditions under which the relations of landlord and tenant in the two countries were carried on; differences not adequately dealt with either by the Chief Secretary or Mr. Balfour in their speeches to the House, but which have forced recognition in the teeth of hostile forces.

That the nature of property in land is in the highest degree artificial, a moment's thought will satisfy any reader. We mean to prove this, to enforce our contention that it is not the Irish tenants who should pay a high price for what is really their own, but it is the landlord's creditors who should abate in order that he might possess some surplus. This species of property had its origin in a personal relation between the sovereign and his follower. At first the land

⁶ We are told that the manner in which a stalwart radical "my Lord's" the chance peer he runs against is most edifying.

⁷ The communication of their old burdens under the tenure of chivalry was compassed by a bloodless revolution. We are not a Radical, but——!

could not be alienated at all. The personal services of the Knight were the consideration for the grant, there was not that privity of understanding between the grantor and an alienee of the grantee which would secure to the grantor the services to be performed by his grantee. The relation was judged to be too remote with the alienee. So much was the idea of this service rooted in the nature of tenure that a female heir, it was contended, could not succeed her father in the possession, she could not render the services annexed to the estate. At least this lead to one feudal incident the sovereign's control of such an heir, a control extending even to her right to marry the husband of her choice; and we know that this incident was, with wardship, one of the burdens of feudal tenure when the military tenures were abolished under the Stewarts.

So far this shows that the grantee of land was at one time a servant holding by virtue of office, even as a coachman or a gardener has his house by his service to-day; that the continuance in possession depended on the performance of the service, as in the case of coachman or gardener. In its essence it was property of no higher sanction than the laborer's in his cottage and plot as long as the latter discharged the duties annexed to his tenure. The latter was a serf, no doubt, on the land of his lord, that is, his *employer*, but the employer was a vassal on the land of the King, notwithstanding his manors and lordships and retainers. Both words mean the same status, that is the degree of servant, and there is warrant for the opinion that tenure so depends on status that it cannot be a contract simply.⁸

By the power of the Great Barons, the statute so well known to real property lawyers—the statute *de donis conditionalibus*—was passed to defeat a right which had gradually accrued to the descendants of the King's grantees themselves, in other words, a right which had accrued to themselves. That is to say, the exercise of the power of alienation, by way of what among the lessees of terms of years was called subletting, was confirmed to them, a form of sub-demise, with which we are familiar in Ireland in the rise of those middlemen, on whose heads so many censures have fallen. The feudal alienation came about by a process known as granting a sub-fee for services to the Lord granting it, on the analogy of the latter's services to the King, his own immediate superior. As we had in Ireland middlemen under middlemen, in descending series, down to the occupier or cottier tenant of an acre of bog, so there came to pass descending grades of subinfeudation from the

⁸ The condition of the clansman was one of status under the Brehon Laws. He could not be alienated from the tribal land (ordinarily), but his possession was frequently changed by redistributions.

Baron who rode out with several thousand horsemen to the Knight who could hardly muster the "furniture" of a lance; namely, the five men who were to be the quota in his superior's train.

In other words, to prevent the alienation of land, which they themselves had been doing, or at least aiming to obtain the power of doing for centuries, the nobles passed the statute we have just mentioned, the effect of which was to tie up in perpetuity in their own hands and the hands of their descendants the lands they had been in the habit of alienating, in the manner we have described. In connection with this transaction, there is a fact which still further goes to show the purely artificial character of landed property for which in the Chief Secretary's measure, and in the language of the various speakers in the Landlords' Convention at Dublin and the articles of all writers on that side of the question without exception a nature is claimed, so solemn, awful and inviolable, that nothing in social and political institutions can compare with, that nothing in great religions can go beyond. When royal acknowledgment established the growing custom of subinfeudation by making it a right of quasi-alienation, the Barons passed this statute to prevent alienation. There was no doubt when confirmed, the accompaniment of the restriction that all the sub-fees should be held immediately by the King instead of mediately through the Lord, was a great blow to the political power of the Barons; but this alternation of blowing hot and cold with regard to the tenure of land by the landlords themselves, sweeps away all foundation for the idea of unchangeableness in that relation. The inconsistencies in the formation of this kind of property are not yet exhausted. We only wonder that the satirist has not employed his gift upon the subject, he has not spared religion, but landed property is beyond him. We understand now that after the Statute de Donis estates tail could not be alienated; they were held in an iron frame from which there was no breaking forth; from the sky to the centre of the earth, certain men owned all; estates should go down the channel of descent according to the intention of the grantor or settlor, for he ruled Parliament. This was the law governing settled lands, that is, all lands not in the Dead Hand of Corporations,⁹ in England from Edward I. to Edward IV., a period of nearly two hundred years, when at length the strictness of the law was relaxed in the most extraordinary manner, by one of those judicial decisions which have made the Common Law. *Taltarum's* case is that by which the breach was made. The transfer of the estate to a purchaser could on the authority of that case thenceforth be affected in a cumbrous

⁹ We are speaking of lands the root of the title to which was the tenure of chivalry.

and most absurd way, by means of what was called a Recovery—a process said by recent writers to be as effectual¹⁰ as the Modern Real Property Statutes in enabling a tenant in tail or a tenant for life jointly with him to bar the issue in tail. The next turn in the wheel was again to restrain alienation from the family of a purchaser, that is to say it was a reversal of the previous Revolution by Taltarum's Case, which was a reversal of the Statute De Donis' Policy, and so to ensure it to the purchaser's remote descendants. This was accomplished by the invention of the system of settlements which, with some modifications has come down from the close of the sixteenth century; and which, like other discoveries, or the extraction of principles or doctrines of remarkable subtilty, evinces the keenness of intellect of those lawyers. The Recovery which it was decided took the supposed effect in Taltarum's case, that is the effect of conveying the title and possession to the "demandant," or plaintiff from the tenant in tail, was nothing but a mock action by which all the precedents and customs of two centuries were cast to the winds, by a judicial decision, treating a figment as a reality. Again, invention of modern settlements which is mainly based on a highly technical distinction, affords another step in the factitious growth of this species of property. Taking hold of what is included in a feoffment or the granting of an estate in fee, by livery of seisin and the constructive possession given by a term of years, and splitting them in sunder by a most unexpected application of a statute, namely, the Statute of Uses, we have the essence of the modern settlement. Actually defeating the very purpose for which that statute was passed the doctrine of trusts reestablishes estates tail as before Taltarum's case, and it is on this invention the title to almost all the estates in England rests to-day. Nothing more artificial can be dreamt of than all we have been sketching. By means of this system land is constituted the exceptional property to which every one bows; and it is tied up to-day almost as it was after the Statute de Donis, and with this mischievous effect that improvement in the productive qualities of the soil is attended with difficulty and with this greater evil that vast tracts which might be turned to the use of the public are kept in parks or for the preservation of the more expensive and higher kinds of game, such as pheasants and deer, while food is imported from every continent at the expense of the working classes. It is really irritating when one thinks of it, that a system so highly artificial as that by which the species of property we have been considering has been

¹⁰ This must be questioned. The principle of breaking down the Statute de Donis was not established absolutely. In Henry VII.'s reign the judges held that the donor of an estate-tail might restrain the tenant from suffering a recovery.

treated should be deemed to confer rights to which all other private rights and the responsibilities of government must bow. From the care that is taken of the claims of those Irish landlords and the mortgagees behind them, one would fancy that the tranquility of Ireland and the stability of the empire are but minor considerations, those claims—lost, in fact perhaps, by the most equitable legislation ever enacted—but in the main and without a perhaps lost¹¹ by the action of economic forces—those claims we say—are paramount to all other interests.

From the Chief Secretary's description of them the Irish landlords in their day of tribulation would seem to be one of those august oligarchies passing from the daylight into the night of history with a sort of heroic grandeur in which they seem greater in death than life, if history and monumental injuries borne by the masses of the Irish people did not contradict him. These universal facts of suffering reveal themselves on the surface of their own country and proclaim themselves in distant lands as the sentence of the moral and material universe on the landlord. If we did not contradict him, one would suppose we meant it to go forth that the Irish landlords were an historic aristocracy like that of old France or England, like that of Spain, of all the German States, of every European country instead of being the descendants of the half insane, ignorant and low born sectaries that infested England in the seventeenth century.¹² Look at them, take the names up one by one, and will there be found in that Landlords' Convention of April last, except some few names, a name written in the story of Ireland or on the pages of the empire, except in some obscure connection with the country as an adventurer, a spy, a plunderer, a slayer of the people, each one of these it is who at the same time is boasting ad nauseam to government and the English people that in one or other of these capacities he subdued, or he preserved Ireland for England and therefore deserves that nation's thanks.

Why! read the names at the Convention the other day as we have said and with the exception of a few, you will fancy you are reading the muster-roll of one of Cromwell's regiments, and when you hear a Westropp you fancy it is one of the wild sergeants pouring out provincial English and the spirit on his hearers. In one of its lucid intervals the *Times* charged those landlords with having renounced their duties with foreheads of brass and hearts of iron. They are,

¹¹ Froude described government in Ireland as the rule of a despotic oligarchy tempered by assassination; we describe it as the government of insolent clerks.

¹² Lord Clare, so praised by Mr. Froude, speaks of the predecessors of these historic families in this way in the House of Lords in the Debate on the Union.

we declare they are governed by the spirit of the No Popery laws when judges said they supposed there was no such being as a Roman Catholic in Ireland, a spirit not in any sense a spirit of coercive legislation for religion indeed, but a spirit of conquest and spoliation. This spirit would not desire the Irish to become Protestants, because then they would have acquired the rights of citizens, a thing which no descendant of a Puritan peasant could allow.¹³

Well as we have said all along we wish the measure to pass, but what is more to the purpose that it will achieve the end for which its introducer hopes. We give to the Chief Secretary credit for the desire to do all that he can to make the people if not prosperous, at least comfortable. We have said we are not looking for the dawn of a paradise in which to use Doctor Traills' metaphor at the Landlords' Convention, the Lion and the Lamb will lie down together. Indeed his own moderation would almost be a guarantee for the impossible in conciliation, but hopes have been blasted before now. We are glad that the lying down in question was not performed by one animal getting inside the other, though Dr. Traill seemed to think something of this kind was the method, but was too astute to say which of the two was the enclosing animal. He wished it to be inferred that the landlords played the part of the "valiant lion" in any case. He takes his choice, though the tenants pay the money. At the same time we can understand that even Irish landlords may cease to roar them otherwise than gently as any sucking dove, notwithstanding such belligerencies as flashed from Colonel O'Callaghan Westropp and Mr. MacNamara at the convention when they will have nothing to roar about, when they will not even possess the excuse of holding up the bag of the mendicant to England. They will realize there will be no ground for thinking that the tenants who increased the value of their property ninefold in a half dozen generations,¹⁴ are robbers when these will have ceased to be tenants, and so have lost the opportunity for plunder. Our own private opinion is that the robbery was on the other side, but the Government, thinks not, and hence a scheme to purchase at an extravagant price.

Notwithstanding the invectives pronounced on the Act of 1881 by Mr. Balfour, Sir Alexander Miller and so many wise men, notwithstanding that it is held forth as the torch of civil war and the signal for universal robbery by so many "oratorical" men, we are sure it has done one good thing, and this one good thing draws to it

¹³ For this view of the intention and employment of the No Popery laws we have the authority of Edmund Burke, himself a Protestant, and Arthur Young, an Englishman.

¹⁴ In 1729 the valuation of all Ireland was less than £2,000,000. In 1875 the rental alone of lands outside towns was £17,000,000.

great moral influences; it has enabled the peasant to walk with head erect instead of bending to the earth before his honor, the landlord, some fellow descended from a Fight-the-Good-Fight-of-Faith-Wheeler or a Bind-their-Kings-in-Chains-and-their-Nobles-in-Fetters-Stafford or his right hand man, the agent, and fawning on every subordinate in the employment of the estate, bribing each one of the greedy creatures that devoured what the landlord and the agent passed over in the reckoning. "I never could stand straight in the presence of a great man," said Sir Pertinax MacSycophant to his son, in order to impress on him the duty of servility when profitable. The Irish peasant is no longer compelled by a sickening sense as of some calamity hanging over him which drives him to crawl to the feet of persons such as these, that abasement which is the last fall, that from which man can rise no more. After more than two centuries of degradation and suffering such as no imagination could body forth, the Irish peasant owes to William Ewart Gladstone that he can bear himself like a man. What does the Chief Secretary mean by the dynastic wars fought in Ireland by the English regicides? What by the suffering of that "splendid aristocracy" of London tapsters, broken serving men, mad peasants from the Eastern countries, the cheats and bullies in the Parliament army? What does he mean by telling us of these an aristocracy? The first link from the chain was struck off in 1870, other links in 1881 by the great measure of which we have spoken a little. Unfortunately, circumstances were too strong for justice even inspired by genius, bad seasons, the importation of cattle, corn and other produce of the farm prevented the fair trial of the measure. Let the peasant for whom Mr. Gladstone has done so much and on whose behalf he has written principles in English public life that cannot be repudiated live in the hope that in due time, and perhaps a near time, will come the great consummation of all, the right to administer his own affairs. We think the present measure may be a glimmer of the dawning of that era.

GEORGE McDERMOT, C. S. P.

New York, N. Y.

THE CONSERVATION OF ENERGY AND VOLUNTARY ACTIVITY.

THE subject of this paper, "The Conservation of Energy and Voluntary Activity," constitutes one of the most difficult and perhaps the most important problems that the Christian Psychologist has to face. The Determinists declare that in the demonstration of the quantitative constancy of cosmic energy, voluntary activity and freewill have received a blow from which they will never recover. In fact some doubt has been thrown on the very existence of liberty, as we conceive it, and we are told that if there be any agencies, which were hitherto considered as outside the material universe, they either do no work at all, or what we call the human soul, God, and spiritual beings are nothing else than material agents subject to the inevitable laws that rule material creation. The spirituality of the human soul disappears in this materialistic onslaught, the being of God is dragged down to the level of material phenomena, and human freedom becomes an impossibility. The Determinist is not yet satisfied. If he grants the spirituality of the soul, he urges that it is a force outside the material universe, and as the sum of cosmic energy remains ever the same, the soul never acts upon the body nor the body on the soul; they are but two parallel manifestations of the same substance. Man is a simple piece of mechanism which can indeed transform one kind of energy into another, but to act upon this energy, direct it or influence it in any way is for man impossible. He has no choice in the matter, he has no freedom, he belongs to the material universe and no amount of ingenuity on the part of the Christian Psychologist will raise him from his lowly position.

These are the leading difficulties that are raised against the traditional teaching which we all accept. It is not my intention to refute all these charges directly, were it even possible in the space allowed me. I shall confine myself directly to the reconciling of two principles, the truth of which I shall take for granted—that voluntary activity is not incompatible with the conservation of energy, nor is the latter in any way destructive of liberty. They act harmoniously together, either being preserved in its integrity without detriment to the other. I have selected this aspect of the subject for treatment, as it has not received among English Psychologists the prominence it deserves.

Let us begin in the old scholastic fashion by defining our terms. It does not require much observation to discover that bodies act on one another, and influence one another in various ways. By their

action, momentum is communicated to other bodies, which are thereby set in motion. In other words work is done. The capacity for doing work is called *Energy*. The *Energy*, then, of a body is its capacity for doing work, and is measured by the work which the body can do in changing to some standard state as regards its position and velocity. If, for instance, we place a stone on the edge of a projecting cliff, a touch will send it over the edge, and in its fall to the ground it can do work; for if we imagine it attached to another stone by a cord passing over a pulley fastened at the top, it, in its fall, will draw this other stone up. The falling stone has energy. The energy of a body which depends on its position is called *Potential Energy*. Thus a body suspended by a cord has potential energy. We need not impart any velocity to set it in motion; it will be quite sufficient to cut the cord; the motion which it acquires from the moment the cord is cut till it reaches the earth is the measure of its potential energy. The energy of a body which depends on its motion, as the energy of a flying bullet, is called *Kinetic or Actual Energy*. The energy of the body may change from potential to kinetic and from kinetic to potential. Thus the stone at the edge of the cliff has, in its state of rest, potential energy, but when it topples over it acquires motion in falling or kinetic energy, and the kinetic energy it has when it strikes the ground is equal to the potential energy it had when resting on the top of the cliff.

The quantity of cosmic energy always remains constant, and in the transition from one state to another no energy is lost or gained. A cannon ball flying through the air exhibits energy of motion; but when it strikes an obstacle it stops. The motion has apparently stopped also, but if we examine the obstacle and the ball, we shall find that this is not the case. The cannon ball and the obstacle it strikes have both been heated, and thus the motion of the ball has simply been transformed into a different kind of motion, which we recognize in the increased temperature of the obstacle and ball. We can thus enunciate the doctrine of the conservation of energy: "The total energy of any material system is a quantity which can neither be increased nor diminished, by any action between the parts of the system, though it may be transferred into any of the forms of which energy is susceptible." Into the enunciation of this doctrine there enter some terms that require a word of explanation. By a *material* system we mean, an aggregate of material points considered as a unity, subject to a moving force and capable under the influence of this force of doing work. The forces which act upon a system are twofold—internal and external—the former are those that result from the interaction of the parts that go to make up the system; the latter proceed from agents external to the system or out-

side of it. We may accept it, then, as an established truth that "The sum of the kinetic and potential energies of any isolated system of bodies remains constant," or in still more general terms, "The sum total of energy in the universe remains always the same."

This doctrine of the conservation of energy was primarily a physical doctrine, and has been developed in connection with the physical sciences, but it justifies the supposition that there may be a connection between living and non-living nature. Fortified by this suspicion, Biologists have worked hard to arrive at the truth; and though up to a short time ago man was considered by Physicists outside all material systems, and as man, outside the material universe, they are now justified, from the close analogy that exists between the phenomena exhibited by non-living and living nature, in placing him in a material system, where he is subjected, in a measure that can be proximately ascertained, to the energies of the material universe. It will be interesting to sketch briefly the process of observation and experiment which enabled Biologists to arrive at their conclusions. As we have seen, a body in motion when brought suddenly to a stand-still generates heat, and heat in turn under certain conditions generates motion. These two phenomena in connection with energy are incontestable facts, and if we find in living organisms parallel phenomena we shall be justified in extending our premises further still. Now the living organism also exhibits motion and heat, and hence physical energy whose quantity is stable must be correlated with other forms of energy, and it required but a single step to infer that the same energy controls the living and the non-living world. Hitherto living forces had been considered as standing apart from material creation, and distinct in themselves, but the formulation of the law of the *correlation of forces* induced Biologists to consider that the living organism might be looked upon as a machine, which is capable of converting energy from one form into another. Thus a steam engine is fed with fuel, in which there is stored energy under a certain form. The rays of the sun shining during the countless ages that are gone were seized upon by the growing plants and stored away in a potential form in the wood which afterwards became coal. This coal being placed in the furnace liberates its energy in the form of heat, this heat vaporizes the water, and the vapor produced, and collected under high pressure, is, by a mechanical contrivance, applied to the driving-wheel and results in the motion of the engine. Can the same facts not be verified of the living animal organism? It, too, is fed with food containing a store of energy, and all the energy exhibited by the living organism should be accounted for by the energy which was stored in the food, and conversely all the energy

stored away in the food should be found manifested by the living organism. If we admit the doctrine of the conservation of energy, this should, in theory at least, present no difficulty, but to prove it by experiment was no easy undertaking. Biologists, however, with an intense desire for truth, have not been deterred by the difficulties of experiment, and though the results have not been quite satisfactory they have gone far to prove that the doctrine of the conservation of energy has its place in living organisms. The result of these experiments may be thus stated: "The general income and outgo of the body as concerns matter and energy is such that the body must be regarded as a machine, which, like other machines, simply transforms energy without creating or destroying it. To this extent, at least, animals conform to the law of the conservation of energy and are veritable machines."¹ These machines are complicated and living, and, of course, different from mechanical contrivances, but in their working we find a striking analogy between them and a piece of mechanism.

If we trace the working of the living machine a little more in detail, we shall find an almost perfect analogy between the phenomena which it manifests and those of the steam engine, whose action we have already described. The living machine transforms food into energy, and the first factor in this transformation is *digestion*, which, by means of gastric juices stored in the organism, breaks up the molecular structure of the food, and produces changes which are quite familiar to the chemist. The food which is thus broken up is ready for a second process which is termed the *absorption of food* from the organ into the blood. The digested food passes down the alimentary canal in a soluble state in a purely mechanical fashion, by muscular action, and when it arrives at a certain point, it passes through the walls of the intestine into the blood. The force engaged in effecting this process is called osmosis. The next factor that comes into operation is the *circulatory system*. It is a device of nature for the distribution of the food or nutriment throughout the entire system. In the very centre of this system is a pump, which keeps the blood in motion. It pumps with rhythmic regularity, drawing the blood from one side and forcing it into the other. The blood in its passage through the intestine receives the food, then carries it to whatever part of the system needs it, and in its passage through the lungs it is charged with oxygen to make up for the waste that is continually occurring in the system.

The next process which must be taken into account is that of *respiration*. Oxygen is, as we know from experience, absolutely necessary for life, and consequently the living machine, if it is to live,

¹ The mechanism of life.—Conu p. 37.

requires oxygen. This is brought about by the circulatory system which exposes the blood, for an instant, to the air, in its passage through the lungs. The lungs contain an almost indefinite number of air cells, which are filled and emptied again by the action of the muscles of the thorax. The relation of the air in these cells to the blood is quite simple, as but a thin membrane separates them. There is a substance in the blood called haemoglobin, whose peculiar relations to oxygen are well known to the chemist. It unites chemically with oxygen under sufficient pressure, which if lessened, the union is broken up. The oxygen pressure in the air is sufficiently high to bring about this union, and the blood charged with oxygen is carried to whatever part of the system requires it.

There is still another process that needs a few words of explanation in tracing the law of the conservation of energy to its remotest bearings—the *process of the removal of waste*. In the steam engine the latent energy of the coal is liberated by oxidation. The oxygen of the air unites with the oxygen of the fuel and breaks it up into the simpler substances, carbonic dioxide, water and ash; and as the energy contained in the original fuel cannot be retained by the simpler compounds it escapes as heat. The same process, with some differences in detail, obtains in the living machine. The food after reaching the cell is united with the oxygen, and broken up into simpler compounds; the contained energy is liberated and escapes as motion, nerve impulse, nerve wave, and muscular action. The wastes are removed by the excretory system.

There still remains a task for the Biologist. When he applies mechanical principles and material laws to the nervous system, he is confronted with difficulties on every side, and so little progress has he made in this department of biology, as far at least as cosmic energy is concerned, that we can gather no well-established data on the point. On the subject of sensation there is some grounds for arriving at valuable conclusions, as regards the auditory and optic nerves, and so far there is probably a correlation between cosmic and nervous energy; but the Biologist can go no further; he has reached, we fancy, the limit of his science, valuable though his contribution to the world of knowledge has been. Mental phenomena defy all human contrivance to measure them or analyze them. They are spiritual and can be but measured by themselves.

You will have noticed that these phenomena we have been describing are, in the main, phenomena of the organic life in man. The law of the conservation of energy may be thus far traced and verified, and Psychologists have no difficulty in granting that in this measure it is manifested in the living machine. In the process of operation of the living machine we notice four distinct factors.

There is first the food that is consumed; secondly, the physico-chemical forces by which this food is broken up and its stored energy liberated; thirdly, there is some mysterious force, vital force, we may call it, underlying these phenomena, which directs them, uses them, qualifies them, and produces from them the human body; there is fourthly the body itself resulting from their conjoint action. Physical science can tell us all about the food that is consumed, it can explain how this food is broken up in virtue of chemical affinity, and it can analyze the product of these forces and energies that have been called into action; but that hidden vital force, that mysterious energy, which these forces in their action, suppose and condition in the living organism, which directs them and qualifies them, and effects an ordered change and which increases the organized body, escapes the observation and eludes the grasp of physical science. The progress that has been made in recent years in the study of the organic cell and protoplasm held out a hope that even the vital factor would give up its secrets in the interests of science; but scientists must never be too hasty in formulating a conclusion that their premises do not warrant. They have gone so far as to say that life is not a distinct force, but simply a name given to that highly complex chemical compound protoplasm. I suppose we may look forward to the day when we shall have beeves turned out to order and labeled "made in Germany." It is a specious method of argument, but one that is altogether fallacious, to conclude from the fact that certain highly complex compounds are found in intimate association with life, that life itself arises from the complex combination of chemical elements. When the chemist or Biologist is able to make a piece of living protoplasm, we shall believe that life is not a distinct force, but this has yet to be done.

II.

It is evident then that the phenomena we have been tracing are, in man, associated with a vital principle, and, in their operation, condition a vital principle, which must be outside and independent of them. In man this vital principle is a subsisting and immaterial reality, as we can easily gather from its acts, which are independent of matter—spiritual and unextended in themselves. It is outside all material systems and emerges from the material universe. It exists independently of matter, and its specific acts matter could never produce. In man this vital principle is the soul. It is a reality that subsists of itself, independently of any co-existent material principle. It, nevertheless, has a destination to matter, and with the body constitutes a substantial unity. It is, in scholastic

terminology, the form of the body, and exists on the confines of material and spiritual substances, and is the connecting link between the material and the spiritual world. It supplies in man a threefold function or rather it is the principle of a threefold life. Man grows like the plant; he is a sentient being like the animal, and he surpasses both, in the fact that he can understand and will. The soul in man is the reality that this threefold life conditions. As I said, the soul exists outside the material universe, and this gives rise to the scruples of determinists, who affirm that since the soul of man is external to the material universe, it does not act upon matter. Otherwise it would do work, and the demonstrated principle of the constancy of cosmic energy would fall to the ground.

Above then the material elements of the body, above the plant life and the sentient life in man, there exist intelligence and will which constitute the intellectual life. It consists in a magisterial and directive power which man possesses over himself in all his acts. The act of intelligence or understanding is that operation which apprehends the essences of things, as truth, justice and beauty, which distinguishes the true from the false, which apprehends spiritual things in themselves, and material things, abstracted from all their individual conditions. The act of the will or voluntary activity is that operation, in man, which has for its object all good, whether sensible or immaterial, and which aspires to the supreme good itself. The faculty which gives man possession and dominion of himself is called free will, and it enables man to act or remain passive, to do this or that, in any given circumstances whatsoever. We may then define the intellectual life in man—"a life which is exercised under the dominion of intelligence and will, in complete possession of itself."

Since the human soul is a spiritual principle, does it in reality act upon the body? It seems strange that such a question should be possible. To us there is nothing more evident. We make up our mind to move from one place to another, our body gets into motion consequent on our determination and "there's an end of it." Our consciousness tells us, and convinces us beyond all possibility of intellectual dissent that it is so, and we should wreck the fundamental criterion which is the measure of our best convictions did we deny it. This is not all. Materialistic science has given us a handle against itself, and has supplied definite results that prove the interaction of the soul and the body. Thought, says Moleschott,² makes its influence profoundly felt in the material states of the body. It is well known that the nerves are the theatre of those phenomena which often produce muscular contraction and consequently move-

² Cf. *Kreislauf des Lebens*, p. 153.

ment. A discovery that we owe to Bois-Raymond shows that there exists in all the nerves an electric current, and it enables us to bring to light interesting relations between thought and material phenomena which take place in us. Bois-Raymond has proved that all nervous activity, whether as movement in the muscles, or as sensation or intellectual activity in the brain, is accompanied by a modification of the electric current in the nerves and a diminution of its intensity. The same distinguished scientist further adds that the electric current in the nerves effects also a chemical transformation of the nerve substance, and a sustained intellectual effort, he continues, is followed by the pangs of hunger and a rise in temperature. These demonstrated facts prove that the soul acts upon the body, and that it enters into composition with the body, so that from the two there results a substantial unity which forms the radical principle of human operation. The soul is the form of the body and enters into substantial union with it.

III.

We have already seen that the soul in man is the principle of a threefold life—of organic life, sentient life and intellectual life. These three forms of vitality arising from a single principle are correlated with other forms of life, and in their operation have special bearings on one another, and tend, each in its own determined measure, to a definite end. It is absolutely necessary to make these points clear, if we would grasp the principles by which the central difficulty is solved. We have seen that the organic life in man is analogous with the organic life in plants and inferior animals. It is of course more complicated in man than in the plant, and more perfect than in the animal, but the phenomena of life in all bear a strict resemblance to one another. S. Thomas has no hesitation in affirming that the sensitive life in man and in the animal is of the very same nature, with a slight difference however which is foreign to the sentient life itself. “The *vis cogitativa* and memory in man derive their superiority over the *vis æstimatoria* and memory in animals not from the fact that they belong to the sensible part of man’s nature, but from a certain alliance and kinship with reason in their interaction with it.”³ “We must observe,” says the great Doctor, in another place, “that as far as sensible forms are concerned, there is no difference between man and the animal; they experience in fact the same impression of sensible things on the senses.”⁴ The body, animated by the soul is the subject of the organic and sentient

³ I. p., q. 78, a. 4, ad. 5.

⁴ Ibidem, q. 78, a. 4.

life, whereas the intellectual life is subjected in the soul alone. The exercise of all the faculties depends from the soul as their principle, though all are not subjected in it.⁵ There is a distinct ordination in the faculties of the soul. The organic life is ordered to the sentient, as the sentient is ordered to the intellectual life.

We find in the plant, in the animal and in man an ordination to an end that leaves them no choice. To use the words of the Angelic Doctor an inclination or a certain destination accompanies every form.⁶ The plant grows and develops in a given way under laws whose influence it cannot escape; the animal is dominated by instinct, and its field of choice is restricted to the narrowest limits; man of necessity desires happiness, he has a transcendental destination to it which he cannot elude, but his field of choice is boundless. Wherever we find a participation of this ordered end, we shall find an inclination towards it, and its apprehension elicits desire and movement. "In the animal movement follows the appetite inevitably, and the appetite follows apprehension."⁷ When the animal sees anything that promotes his good or ministers to his pleasure, he at once sets about procuring it. He has no choice in the matter, he is not free. In man's sentient life, we find the same phenomena, but in him the movements of the sentient life are subject to reason, which exercises a controlling and directing power over man's sentient acts. "The inferior appetite is obedient to reason or intelligence," says S. Thomas, "which moves and directs it by means of the cognitive faculty, and to the will, the moving power, which moves it by means of the intelligence."⁸ The sensitive appetite is also subject to the will, in its acts, which the motive power of the will produces. In other animals movement follows the stimulus of the appetite, because there is not in them a superior restraining force. But man is not moved by the inferior appetites immediately, because he is governed by his will, which is the superior moving faculty.⁹ We find then, according to the Psychology of S. Thomas, that the movements of man's sentient life are subject to the government of reason and will. All of these have a natural destination to an end, and consequently to the particular good which participates in the nature of that end. There is a difference however between man and the animal. The animal is moved necessarily to the good which elicits the desire of his appetite; but man, being free, and governed by reason and will, has in himself a prohibitive or restraining force, which holds the lower appetites in subjection, and allows them to

⁵ Cf. q. 77, aa. 6 and 7.

⁶ Ibidem, q. 80, a. 1.

⁷ Ibidem, q. 81, a. 3.

⁸ I. p., q. 81, a. 1.

⁹ Ibidem, a. 3.

act only in accordance with the dictates of reason. And though our intellectual knowledge depends, in considerable measure, from the knowledge of the senses, the will can act on the inspiration of an intellectual judgment and reject the dictates of sense and passion. The will in man has not only the power to command and direct the acts of the sentient life; it has further the power to move and direct itself. We can distinguish in the will a threefold act of volition. First of all there is an essential or natural propensity which is nothing else than a tendency to an object that will conduce to its perfection; there is, in the second place, an instinctive act of volition, which is a propensity or tendency following on the apprehension of an object as good, and there is still further the rational volition of the will, which follows the deliberate act of reason, and is the tendency to an object presented as desirable by a deliberate act of the mind.

Though we have distinguished the acts of the sentient life in man from those of his intellectual and volitional life, we must not imagine that they originate in or proceed from different principles. The soul is the principle of every act of man. S. Thomas tells us that in human acts those of the inferior or sentient life bear to those of the superior or intellectual life the relation of matter to form, so that the act of the sentient life being commanded by the will, and elicited from the sentient faculties is a single human act, just as the body and soul which is its form, in their substantial union, constitute a single individual man. This would not be verified if the sentient life in man were not ordered to the intellectual and volitional life; being, however, ordered to one another, from whichever source the act proceeds, whether from the sentient or from the intellectual faculties, it is a single individual act.¹⁰

There is in man a single individual life, arising from a simple and spiritual substance, which supplies the functions of a threefold life. This principle is outside the material universe, it is immaterial and master of itself, and, as we have seen, acts upon the body and influences it. We have to reconcile two facts—the quantitative energy of the material universe is constant and invariable, and it consequently excludes the action of all forces outside the material universe. We have a second fact—the soul of man is a force outside the universe, it acts upon the body which belongs to the material system, and liberates its potential energy which results in motion. The first of these facts is solidly established by experiment; it is the result of observation we must admit, but it is a fact that we have to admit, since it has not yet been disproved. The second fact rests on still stronger evidence; it is witnessed to by our internal consciousness,

¹⁰ Cf. 1, 2, q. 17, a. 4.

which is in complete agreement with the dogmas of physical science. In reconciling these two facts, while preserving the truth of both intact, many solutions have been offered, most of which are extremely unsatisfactory.

IV.

The first solution that we have to consider opens up a very simple and expeditious way of getting rid of all difficulties. It denies point blank the truth of the doctrine of the conservation of energy and asserts loudly that it is not proved. This solution is inevitable to its authors, because, according to them the human will in acting on the body does work which of necessity adds to the sum of cosmic energy. Since then the will is outside the material universe, and its action on the body is certain, the sum total of the energy in the material universe is not constant. We grant willingly that the quantitative constancy of cosmic energy is an empirical fact, and has not the guarantee of metaphysical certainty, but it is physically certain and has the force of a physical law. It is the duty of every Philosopher to accept it till it has been disproved. That the will in acting on the body does work is defended by the argument that consciousness witnesses to the fact. It is quite true we are conscious that the will acts on the body in changing its potential energy to kinetic energy, but *how* it acts our consciousness does not tell us, and this is precisely the point at issue. We may then dismiss the first solution as unsatisfactory.

Freycinet,¹¹ a distinguished French scientist, gives us a simple solution, as he himself terms it. The constancy, he says, of energy shall not be violated, as regards quantity, if man in all his acts—even those that are voluntary, effects an exact equilibrium between the energies outside himself and the work which he does; it seems that this is what actually does happen. Man is a machine, into which substances pass and are consumed, and which retains the energies necessary for its activity. Liberty or voluntary activity adds nothing to the fund of physical energies; it is simply an episode in their transformation. This solution is simple indeed, but it is superficial and useless. In the first place it advocates, as far as one can gather, ultra-dualism, and the theory of psycho-physical parallelism according to which the union between soul and body is not substantial but only accidental. We all know that man has, at all times, a fund of potential energy under his control, but the question is, does all the energy man calls into play and expends come out of this fund and from it only? It is quite clear that the question at issue remains

¹¹ Cf. *Essais sur la philosophie des sciences*—appendice.

untouched. One thing, however, that the distinguished scientist makes clear is that all the actual energy expended in the external actions of man is nothing else—under another form, of course—than the potential energy stored in the organism.

Mathematicians have offered us several solutions, but these are also unsatisfactory and leave the difficulty exactly as they found it. They tell us that all motion in the universe is determined and unchangeable in its existence, in its velocity, and in its intensity, but this is not the case with regard to its direction, and a force may act upon another while in motion and do no work, because it acts at right angles to the direction in which the force is moving, and it may alter this direction indefinitely. The human will, they tell us, is one of these directing forces; it modifies the direction of the molecular movements in the nerve centres, and the external movements of the body, without doing any work whatever. Here, mathematicians assure us, is the solution of the difficulty. It is sufficiently easy to indicate the weak points in this line of argument. The directing force, in the solution, pre-supposes the existence of the force which it directs. Now the will must have the initiative in all its acts, otherwise its liberty is impossible, and all human responsibility disappears. Our consciousness tells us that the will not merely directs the force and motion, but reduces it from a state of potentiality to act. We conceive free-will as something which initiates, something which is adequately determined neither by material circumstances nor by any intellectual conditions. In the solution which we have just given free will and voluntary activity lose their true meaning and hence we must reject it.

In an article in the *Revue Catholique* of 1884, Mgr. Mercier, the distinguished Philosopher and Professor of Louvain, published an article on the solution of this problem based on scholastic principles. The constancy of energy, he says, cannot be denied; but all the attempts to reconcile this principle with moral liberty have failed, because all admit or suppose that the will is the source of kinetic movement. This is altogether opposed to Thomistic teaching. The principle which S. Thomas lays down for the specific distinction of the powers of the soul does not allow us to identify the will with the locomotive powers; consequently the will does no work, and adds nothing to the sum of cosmic energy. The potential forces, he tells us, are actualized by the final cause, and in man and animals by the object which solicits the sentient and intellectual faculties, and these in turn command movement. Mgr. Mercier will not allow that the will, in the process of actualizing the potential energy, is an efficient cause, but it is a formal cause, and is the *sufficient reason* of the change of energy from a potential to a kinetic state.

It is hard to see that this solution is much better than those we have been discussing. Exterior objects are not of themselves sufficient for the actuation of a free principle; that of itself is indetermined, and to say that the will is not an efficient cause in originating or initiating locomotion is to go against the doctrine of S. Thomas,¹² which Mgr. Mercier avowedly advocates, and is also opposed to common sense and the dictates of conscience. If volition is not the efficient cause of the transition from the state of potentiality to act, but the formal cause, this transition should be formally a volition, and every volition should be formally a change in the nerve substance, where the first transition is effected. This I am sure the distinguished Philosopher would be the last to admit.

V.

The attempted solutions that we have been discussing have had one advantage. They have brought the difficulty clearly before us and have enabled us to state it in the clearest terms. We shall not make an attempt to solve it. Everybody admits that the energy man exhibits has been stored away in a potential form in the organism. He takes food which is transformed into energy and conserved in the various organs of the body, awaiting some force to effect the change from its potential state to actual motion. What we want is a force that can bring about this change and actualize this energy without adding anything to its constant quantity. If we can show that the will of man is capable of reducing the potential energy stored up in the human organism to act, without doing any work, we shall have solved the difficulty. We have seen that the sentient and intellectual faculties in man have a destination to an object outside themselves, which leaves them no choice. The will is essentially ordained to the Supreme Good, and it cannot but choose to strive to obtain it; the intellect is essentially ordained to the first principles of truth, and it, of necessity, assents to them; the sentient faculties are essentially ordained to material good, though they are under the domain of intellect and will. All objects that participate in the nature of first principles and Supreme Good have a moral power to solicit the faculties to act. Though each of the faculties of the soul has its particular object, all of them have their principle in the soul; they are ordered one to another, the intellect and the will obtaining the place of command. The body itself is informed by the soul, and from their substantial union there results a composite living being, in which is stored under a potential form all the energy that is manifested in human life.

¹² *Contra Gentes* II., cap. 16; III., cap. 23.

The act of the will or volition moves all the faculties of the willing subject, for such is the natural connection of the faculties of the soul, that when one acts all the others respond by natural sympathy, and especially if the faculty that acts be supreme. And in fact we know from experience that there is no act of the will to which the other faculties of the soul do not in some measure respond, even the forces of organic life. This is particularly the case when the act of the will is intense, or the mind is violently disturbed; there is then a complete change in the whole man. When Baltassar saw the writing on the wall, Daniel tells us the effect it had on him: "Then was the king's countenance changed and his thoughts troubled him, and the joints of his loins were loosed and his knees struck one against the other."¹³ There is in man the potential energies of life stored away in the living organism, and since this life has a destination to something outside itself which solicits it to act, if it is to withstand this solicitation and remain master of itself, there must be some counteracting principle to keep it in possession of itself. S. Thomas tells us that the animal is moved by the propensities of the appetite; not so man, because the appetite in him obeys and is subject to the will. This counteracting principle in man is the will, and it maintains the other faculties, if I may use the term, in a state of equilibrium. It not merely restrains the faculties that are subject to it and moves them, but it moves itself. It is a force outside the material universe and united to it in the most perfect of unions, since the soul, of which the will is the moving faculty, is the form of the body. How does the soul move the body? The soul can act upon itself. It moves itself, and in moving itself it reduces the potential energies of life to act, because the life to which these energies belong is the life of the soul and the body since the soul is the form of the body. In actualizing the potential energies of life, the soul does no work since it is outside the material universe and acts upon itself. We may state the argument in other words. The soul, as the principle of intellect and will, acts upon the soul as the form of the body, and reduces, in accordance with ascertained physical laws, the potential energies of life to act.¹⁴

All the conditions that the problem demands are fulfilled. In the first place we have the destination to an object and the propensity to obtain it, in the sentient life, in the intellectual life, and in the voluntary life. We have objects that solicit the faculties and move them, not by any physical force, but by a moral force, or in the order of a final cause. We have then the subjective propensities, and the objective conditions required for action or movement, but

¹³ Dan. v., 6.

¹⁴ Cf. *Revue Thomiste*, Mai, 1897.

these are ruled by an extra-cosmic force which enters into union with them, is their principle, and fulfils the conditions required for organic, sentient and intellectual life, holding them in check, and counteracting their natural propensities to act. It has the power of moving itself, and being the seat and principle of life, all the phenomena of life respond. It has under its command the potential energies of life, and can use them at will. It does no work. As the form of the body it is merely the principle that the potential energy conditions in its state of rest, as a body at rest conditions the plane on which it reposes. As intellect and will it does no work because being an extra-cosmic principle and acting upon itself it does not interfere with the constant quantity of cosmic energy. The liberty of the will is safeguarded, because it has the initiative in all its own acts, in all the acts of the inferior nature and it dominates them. The doctrine then of the conservation of energy is by no means opposed to voluntary activity, nor is the latter in any way destructive of the quantitative constancy of energy. We find them in intimate union, either preserving its integrity without affecting the integrity of the other. They act in complete harmony, and we are justified in holding still that there is no antagonism between the conclusions of physical science and those of Christian Psychology.

MICHAEL M. O'KANE, O. P.

Limerick, Ireland.

Scientific Chronicle.

MODERN SCIENCE AND CREATIVE POWER.

Professor Henslow recently delivered a lecture on "Present-Day Rationalism" in University College, London. During the course of the lecture the Professor stated that modern science neither affirms nor denies creative power in the origin of life. In reply Lord Kelvin (Sir William Thomson) stated that science compels us to accept a creating and directing Power as an article of belief.

As Mr. Knowles, the editor of the *Nineteenth Century*, has been fortunate enough to obtain an authentic statement from Lord Kelvin's own hand, and as the discussion which Lord Kelvin's statement has started shows the importance of the subject, we reproduce Lord Kelvin's position from the *Nineteenth Century* for June, 1903. He writes:

"I am in thorough sympathy with Professor Henslow in the fundamentals of his lecture; but I cannot admit that, with regard to the origin of life, science neither affirms nor denies Creative Power. Science positively affirms Creative Power. It is not in dead matter that we live and move and have our being, but in the creating and directing Power which science compels us to accept as an article of belief. We cannot escape from that conclusion when we study the physics and dynamics of living and dead matter all around. Modern biologists are coming, I believe, once more to a firm acceptance of something beyond mere gravitational, chemical and physical forces; and that unknown thing is a vital principle. We have an unknown object put before us in science. In thinking of that object we are all agnostics. We only know God in His Works, but we are absolutely forced by science to believe with perfect confidence in a Directive Power—in an influence other than physical, or dynamical, or electrical forces. Cicero (by some supposed to have been editor of Lucretius) denied that men and plants and animals could come into existence by a fortuitous concourse of atoms. There is nothing between absolute scientific belief in a Creative Power, and the acceptance of the theory of a fortuitous concourse of atoms. Just think of a number of atoms falling together of their own accord and making a crystal, a sprig of moss, a microbe, a living animal. Cicero's expression 'fortuitous concourse of atoms' is certainly not wholly inappropriate for the growth of a crystal. But modern scientific men are in agreement with him in condemning it as utterly

absurd in respect to the coming into existence, or the growth, or the continuation of the molecular combinations presented in the bodies of living things. Here scientific thought is compelled to accept the idea of Creative Power. Forty years ago I asked Liebig, walking somewhere in the country, if he believed that the grass and flowers that we saw around us grew by mere chemical forces. He answered, 'No, no more than I could believe that a book of botany describing them could grow by mere chemical forces.' Every action of free will is a miracle to physical and chemical and mathematical science.

"I admire the healthy breezy atmosphere of free thought throughout Professor Henslow's lecture. Do not be afraid of being free thinkers! If you think strongly enough you will be forced by science to the belief in God, which is the foundation of all religion. You will find science not antagonistic but helpful to religion."

The statement of Lord Kelvin on the important question of the source of life has occasioned a long and sharp controversy in the *London Times*. In the columns of the *Times* he has been attacked by botanist, mathematician, zoologist, physicist, biologist, etc.

Two important deductions may be drawn from reading the opponents of Lord Kelvin; the first is, that while they deny Creative Power, they offer no alternative, and secondly, their reason for not accepting Creative Power is that they cannot conceive of it. The first shows clearly the limitations of biology as such and its ignorance of the origin of its own subject matter. Ignorance of a thing can never become an argument for its non-existence. Inadequacy of the means offered by a particular science must be supplemented by other legitimate means furnished by some other legitimate branch of science in order to reach the conclusion which the first science unaided could never attain. In the case under consideration the facts furnished by biology must be aided by a process of logical reasoning upon those facts and the logical conclusions must be admitted by every reasonable mind.

This brings us to the consideration of the second deduction of the opponents of a Creative Power, namely, that they cannot admit such a power because they cannot conceive of it. This is a most startling statement in the light of scientific methods in every department of science. If there is one thing that any scientist demands as a matter of belief and to which he appeals in all his investigations it is the principle of causation. Remove this principle and what a sorry picture is presented by the investigator in the laboratory!

Now those scientists who rigorously demand the application of this principle in every step of scientific investigation should logically demand it to explain the existence of the universe. Hence to say

that they cannot conceive of a Creative Power is to abandon at a crucial point the principle of causation, the chief incentive to scientific investigation.

Probably scientific atheism is based largely on the misunderstanding of the two great generalizations of modern science. These great laws are the conservation of energy and the conservation of matter. But in reality what do they mean? Simply this, in our hands we can neither destroy or create matter or energy, and that we believe on the principle of causation that the same effect always follows everywhere the same cause, and hence we generalize. But whence matter and energy? Are we to deny the principle of causation here?

It is refreshing to find such princes of science as Kelvin, Newton, Müller, Locke, Schwann, Pasteur, Liebig and others deeply drinking at the fount of science and impregnated with the true philosophy of science defending from scientific grounds the existence of God in opposition to the agnosticism of Huxley, the materialism of Tyndall, the atheism of Clifford, the skepticism of Fitzjames Stephen, the positivism of Frederic Harrison and the pantheism of Haeckel to understand that science must perforce soon cease her dogmatism, confine herself to her own legitimate sphere and become as she must by right the handmaid of religion.

D. T. O'SULLIVAN, S. J.

Boston, Mass.

Book Reviews.

HISTORY OF THE GERMAN PEOPLE AT* THE CLOSE OF THE MIDDLE AGES.
By *Johannes Janssen*. Vols. V. and VI. Translated from the German by
A. M. Christie. B. Herder: 17 South Broadway, St. Louis, Mo. 1903.

A very delicate and much appreciated compliment was paid to the present writer by Mr. Herder, of St. Louis, in forwarding to him the first advanced copy of the English translation of the third volume of Monsignor Janssen's *History of the German People*, directly it reached this country. This act of courtesy enabled the *Review* to acknowledge receipt of the two volumes in our April number and to promise an extended notice in the current issue. It also gave us full leisure to re-read in print what we had already carefully perused in manuscript.

It may be remembered that we passed some severe strictures upon the translation of the previous volumes; indeed, in view of the fact that the translator (a circumstance then to us unknown) is a lady and a non-Catholic, we must pronounce our criticisms ungallant.

In the course of our remarks upon the version of the second volume, making volumes III. and IV. of the English edition, we had what may be styled the impudence to suggest that "the translation should be carefully overlooked by competent persons," and that "we ourselves would be only too glad to give our services gratuitously, if called upon." These jaunty phrases, so easily written, were destined to involve us in many weeks of severe labor. The distinguished publisher took us at our word, and there was nothing left for us but to redeem our promise. Whether, and how far, our intervention has issued in the improvement of the version, are questions the decision of which we must reserve to the proper tribunal. To us it was a labor of love; and we are not at all disposed to regret the time and anxiety we devoted upon this masterpiece of Catholic historical science, the incomparable excellence of which can be appreciated only by the close study which we were compelled to expend upon it.

Before assuming a fair share of responsibility for the two volumes before us, we may be permitted to state that the first part of this fifth (English) volume came to us already paged, leaving us but a scant opportunity of making revisions. However, as one main source of dissatisfaction with a generally faithful rendering of the original was the omission of important notes, this defect was easily

*This ought to be *from* or *since*.

supplied by throwing the more essential of them into the form of an appendix. For some of these we apprehend the reader will be grateful, as they throw a great light on the text.

We shall draw attention to a few minor inaccuracies before proceeding to the immediate subject of our remarks. It will embarrass some of the readers to find John Frederick styled "Saxon Elector" (p. 42) in the year 1525, the year in which his father John, "the Constant," succeeded the Elector Frederick, John's brother and John Frederick's uncle. At that early period, and until John's death in 1532 this doughty champion of Lutheranism, known to his admirers as "the Magnanimous," was Electoral Prince, or *Kurprinz*, as Janssen correctly terms him.

On page 49 mention is made of an important meeting held at Dessau by *four* princes who had resolved to stand firm for the ancient faith against heresy. As the narrative proceeds we discover that there must have been *five* princes in this Catholic league. If we turn to the original, we find that the name of Archbishop Albert of Mayence has dropped out. So too, on pages 37 and 57, it will puzzle many readers to understand what form of government was in vogue at Nuremburg. On the former page the translation speaks of a "Margraviate of Nuremburg," which never existed in that aristocratic commune. In the second passage very extensive powers are attributed to a *magistrate*. The reader will possibly surmise that the latter version is a poor rendition of the German *Rath*, or Town Council, and such is the case. The passage on page 37 will become intelligible by reading "the Margrave," that is, Casimir, "and Nuremburg." Some of these inaccuracies may conveniently be laid to the charge of the defenceless printer, who, even if innocent in some particulars, deserves punishment for divers obvious slips, as, for instance, for changing our legibly written *priest* into *period* on page 280, line 19, and for several errors in the matter of figures. Witness page 232 of volume sixth, where he gives the Protestant League 46,000 cavalry instead of 4,600. With 46,000 *Reiters*, the Smalcaldeners would have swept the Imperialists from the face of the earth. On the other hand, the 40,000 persons who received Holy Communion at Cologne on the occasion of the election of Ferdinand to be King of the Romans (page 323 note) are reduced by the printer to 10,000. Either figure is large enough to stagger the imagination and proves beyond peradventure that vast multitudes of Germans remained loyal to the ancient Church. These are slips which may easily be remedied by the list of *errata-corrige* which is needful at the end of every valuable book. There is one important mistranslation to which we wish to draw the earnest attention of the reader. It occurs on page 74 of the fifth volume and relates to

the famous Recess of the first diet of Spires, A. D. 1526, which has been a bone of contention for four centuries. Since the Germans themselves have found so great a difficulty in understanding the passage, we cannot blame Miss Christie for failing to render it satisfactorily in English. The German is no easy language to translate at any time, even where the Teutonic brain is making an honest endeavor to transfer the offspring of its convolutions to pen and paper. Who, then, shall follow its meanderings when, of set purpose, it undertakes to "wrap up sentences," not, indeed, in *unskilful*, but in eminently skilful "words?"

To state the matter very briefly: The Imperial Diet which opened at Spires, June 25, 1526, received a communication from the Emperor, Charles V., then absent in Spain, in which he sternly commanded the enforcement of the Edict of Worms, whereby Luther and his heresies were outlawed and condemned. This edict had been very imperfectly executed; in some parts of Germany it had, indeed, been openly disregarded. Several of the Princes, notably John of Saxony and Philip of Hesse, had made public profession of Lutheranism; in many of the Free Cities of the Empire the Catholic religion had been entirely suppressed. A strong Lutheran faction was, therefore, present at the Diet and were determined to resist to the utmost any effort to restrain their "evangelical freedom." Through the skill of their lawyers, they succeeded in so modifying the terms of the *Abschied*, or *Recess*, as to make it read as follows: "*Was das vom Kaiser zu Worms ausgegangene Edict aubelange, hätten sich die Stände einmüthig verglichen: In Sachen desselben, bis zur Abhaltung des Concils mit ihren Unterthanen also zu leben, zu regieren und zu halten, wie ein Jeder Solches gegen Gott und Kaiserliche Majestät zu verantworten hoffe und vertraue.*" Miss Christie translates as follows: "With respect to the edict issued by the Emperor at Worms, the Estates had unanimously agreed that, until the meeting of the Council, they would live, act and rule their subjects *in such wise as each one thought right* before God and his Imperial Majesty." This is precisely the interpretation placed upon the passage by the Lutheran princes and theologians; and is accepted by Protestant jurists as the legal basis of the *jus reformandi* claimed by them for the civil power. Nor were they slow to put the principle into practice. Within six weeks the energetic Landgrave Philip "the Magnanimous" "reformed" the Church of Hesse "in such wise as he thought right," but with scant regard for the views either of God or of the Emperor. Other princely and municipal potentates followed in quick succession; so that, ere long, there were as many independent territorial churches as Protestant magnates in Germany. Now, it is one of Janssen's most meritorious achievements, that he has

convinced even Protestant historians that the official Protestant interpretation of this momentous passage, even though accepted by Ranke, is utterly baseless. It is, indeed, quite at variance as well with the letter as with the spirit of the Recess of Spires. What the Lutheran jurists succeeded in persuading the Estates to agree to "unanimously," was an engagement (which said jurists and their masters had no intention to keep) that all the Estates of the Empire would live, act, and rule their subjects *in such wise as each one should hope and trust that he might answer* to God and his Imperial Majesty." Or, as the translation says on page 198, they should act "in such way as they thought they could justify before God and the Emperor." There was no question, then, of what each one "thought right," but of what the Emperor thought right; and Charles had made known his views and wishes in no uncertain manner. Even had Charles, therefore, confirmed this Recess, he would not have given a legal basis to the novel doctrine of state supremacy in matters of religion. But, on the contrary, he repudiated it from the first, and "struck it out, revoked and annulled it" at the second Diet of Spires in 1529, and it was by their protest against this action of the Emperor that the Lutherans obtained the name of *Protestants*. The Catholics were evidently outwitted; nor was this the only time that they weakened their cause by endeavoring to reconcile the irreconcilable. The Lutheran princes and cities did "what they thought right," suppressing the Catholic worship, confiscating Church property, introducing a new religion of their own devising, and leaving to their subjects the alternative of conforming or of going into exile.

It is this sad story of the destruction of the Catholic religion in Germany and neighboring provinces that forms the subject of the narrative in the two volumes before us. Opening with the year 1525, when Lutheranism had passed beyond the early stage of literary incubation to become a permanent political institution, the year which witnessed the firm establishment of princely despotism upon the failure of the insurrection of the peasantry, it tells the story of the thirty dismal years which closed with the patched up "Religious Peace of Augsburg" in 1555.

The superiority of Jannsen's history of the Reformation over all competitors, even Ranke's, is due to the calmness with which he addresses himself to his task. In this respect he is the typical historian of the best German school; with this difference, that he discusses the agents and events of the Reformation with the same "objectivity" which is the characteristic of German historians when treating of all subjects *except* the Reformation. With the Lutheran historians generally the subject of Luther and his revolution is too sacred for stern analysis. It is a subject so intimately interwoven

with their religious and patriotic instincts, that in dealing with it their reasoning powers seem to be for the time paralyzed. This is all the more striking because their conclusion is in flagrant contradiction to their premises. For some generations German research has busied itself with the study of Catholic progress in the Middle Ages. If the old Protestant tradition that, "under the Papacy," the world sat in utter darkness, ignorance and heathenism, has been dispelled, this has been largely owing to the severe labors of German antiquarians and historians. When, therefore, the first volume of Janssen's *History of the German People since the Close of the Middle Ages* made its appearance, the volume in which he so eloquently described the flourishing condition into which eight hundred years of Christian civilization had brought the dear old Fatherland, Protestants vied with Catholics in giving a hearty welcome to the work of so learned and patriotic a priest. We are told that the book obtained a readier and more extensive sale in the Protestant than in the Catholic sections of Germany. Quite different was the reception which the second volume met with, the volume in which Luther and the other revered "Fathers of the Protestant Reformation" were presented to the reader as they really "lived, acted and ruled their subjects." For years pulpit and press groaned with vituperation of Janssen; the real, old-fashioned, inarticulate rage of Martin himself, which he left as a sacred inheritance to his followers in his historic utterance: "*Impleat vos Dominus odio Papae.*" But, undismayed by the senseless clamor, Janssen kept the even tenor of his way, only condescending to write "A Word to My Critics," followed up by "A Second Word," two little books which made many a Lutheran Goliath feel very uncomfortable.

There are many traits of resemblance between Janssen and our immortal Lingard; the same indefatigable industry; the immense erudition which leaves no scrap of testimony unnoticed; the same judicial fairness of mind which permits facts to speak for themselves and reserves the interpretation of them to the reader. Another great advantage possessed by these two historians was their thorough acquaintance with Catholic faith and practice, enabling them to distinguish between the essential and the accidental. It is the lack of this familiarity with the doctrines and morals of Catholics which is the ever-recurring source of weakness and of ludicrous blunders on the part of even the best-meaning of Protestant writers. It never seems to occur to these writers, some of whom devote years to the study of pagan religions, that a short time spent in learning the true teachings of the Catholic Church from approved authors would be an invaluable aid to an understanding of the course and progress of Church history.

Janssen has been mildly criticized by no less authoritative a master than Dr. Pastor for not having brought forward into sufficient prominence the part played by "German hatred of the Roman Curia" in advancing the cause of Lutheranism. But, with all possible deference to Dr. Pastor, we feel that Janssen is nearer right than his critic. The more profoundly one studies pre-Reformation times in Germany, the more one is persuaded that the mental attitude of the German population towards the Holy See was one of deep affection and sincere reverence. The very fact that a people so reluctant to pay tribute of any kind should be so eager to procure Papal indulgences, is the most convincing of proofs that the German people were passionately attached to the See of St. Peter. The ease with which the Curia raised funds in Germany for any good cause, whilst the civil power found it well-nigh impossible to obtain money for the essential needs of government, is far from arguing the existence of any "hatred of Rome." True, there existed real and imaginary "gravamina." But Janssen's true historical instinct preserved him from making them very prominent elements in his estimate of the causes of the Reformation. The anti-Roman sentiment, in Germany as in England, was not a *cause* but an *effect* of the Reformation. Incendiary pamphlets and speeches, modeled after Luther's demagogic appeal "To the German Nobility," created an anti-papal feeling which, until then, had existed only in an extremely limited circle. We ourselves can remember the ease with which a peaceful population was lashed into a warlike fury by the efforts of a sensational press. Quite similar was the revulsion of popular feeling at the time of the grotesque "Reformation."

To us it seems that the only vulnerable point in Janssen's presentation of German history at the beginning of the sixteenth century is his evident bias towards the House of Hapsburg. This is too large a subject to be treated here; but it is our humble opinion that neither the visionary Maximilian nor his calculating grandchildren, Charles and Ferdinand, deserve the eulogies which our author pays them. The prodigious growth of Hapsburg power and influence could not but excite universal apprehension and antagonism; and we are not surprised at the general coalition against Charles V., in which even the Supreme Pontiff was induced to join. This is a topic which will demand attention when Dr. Pastor brings out the long-delayed fourth volume of his History of the Popes. We are most decidedly of the opinion that one of the most potent factors in the successful spread of Lutheranism was the unjustifiable attempt of Austria permanently to annex Wirtemberg. This lamentable exhibition of Hapsburg greed was deeply resented by the Bavarian Dukes, not only on the score of state policy, since Bavaria was thus

hemmed in on both sides by her powerful neighbor, but also from motives of sentiment, since the young Christopher, whom the Austrian sought to rob of his inheritance was their sister's child. The fear and hatred aroused in the breasts of the German princes by an act of aggression like this were not apt to be quieted by Charles' magnanimous platitude that he "sought neither gold nor provinces, being abundantly furnished with both." We also believe that few of Janssen's readers out of Germany will be inclined to agree with him in his wholesale denunciation of Francis I., bad as that monarch admittedly was. But this is a matter which more immediately concerns the French than it does ourselves. The wars of France and Germany could scarcely have been avoided, disastrous as they were, not only to the two great nations themselves, but also to the general cause of Christendom. This intense patriotism of Janssen is the only defect that can be found in his book, and it may be doubted that his own countrymen, for whom the great work was intended, will be disposed to censure him for it. In the development of German history it was fated that the nation should be compelled to submit to the hegemony of one or other of its princely houses. It battled for centuries, with foreign aid, to shake off the preponderating influence of Austria, only, in our own day, to submit cheerfully to the yoke of Prussia.

As we intend to deal more in detail with the ground covered by Janssen in these two volumes, we earnestly exhort all our readers to purchase and study them.

J. F. L.

THE SEARCH-LIGHT OF ST. HIPPOLYTUS. *The Papacy and the New Testament in the Light of Discovery.* By *Parke P. Flournoy*, with an introduction by Prof. Walter W. Moore, D. D., LL. D. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1896, pp. 250.

Our sole excuse in taking notice of this worthless little book (apparently the composition of a schoolboy) is that we have been requested to do so by persons whose friendship we value. It is the mission of this Review to concern itself about higher game than Mr. Flournoy and his "search-light." The duty of "catching the little foxes that destroy the vines" we may safely leave to others. We shall limit our remarks to the first eighty-seven pages, in which the writer has turned his search-light on the Papacy of the third century, making the astounding discovery that no such institution then existed. So far as we can make out, he has found that the Roman Church in that age was purely Presbyterian in its constitution. This "discovery" is all the more surprising in view of the fact

that the immediate predecessor of St. Zephyrinus and St. Callixtus, St. Victor, was admittedly "every inch a Pope," and a very aggressive one. Surprising also, since Zephyrinus is the Pope whom the contemporary schismatic Tertullian (ill-naturedly, indeed, but for that very reason a valuable witness) terms Pontifex Maximus, Episcopus Episcoporum. But what is the use of a search-light when it has to operate through the medium of a thick fog? and where, even on the Banks of Newfoundland, can we find fogs as thick as those bred by sectarian prejudice? As an instance, we may notice the effect produced by Tertullian's famous passage on the mind of the Anglican writer of the article, *Zephyrinus*, in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*. Cardinal Baronius had quite appropriately cited the lofty titles assigned to the Bishop of Rome "as proof of his then recognized supremacy over the whole Church." To this contention the writer in question naively replies that the passage "shows only what the popes asserted of themselves, not what others thought of them!" It will be hard to persuade the unbiased thinker that if Pope Zephyrinus in the year 200 claimed to be Supreme Pontiff and Bishop of Bishops, his claim must have been well founded. But how can we reconcile even this claim with the "discovery" made by the present unknown Columbus that Rome was then governed in ecclesiastical matters by no bishop at all, but by a board of elders? But, of course, any weapon that comes to hand can fairly be thrown at the Pope!

Mr. Fournoy's "search-light," the work called *Philosophumena*, ascribed to St. Hippolytus, is not so modern an invention as one might be tempted to believe who glanced at Fournoy's title page. It has been known to the world for above fifty years, and, so far from being of service to the adversaries of the papacy, is, if not interpolated, dead against them.

To state the matter in few words: The Catholic Church has always held in high esteem two saints who lived about the year 200—St. Hippolytus and Pope St. Callixtus, or more accurately Callistus. The former was renowned as a valiant defender of the orthodox faith; the name of the latter had been perpetuated by the cemetery which still bears his name. Beyond the fact that both had sealed their Christian profession with their blood, little else was known regarding them. But in the year 1842 a manuscript copy was found in a monastery on Mount Athos of a "Confutation of all Heresies," which the learned world first ascribed to Origen, but which subsequent researches seem to have definitively adjudicated to St. Hippolytus. It is a valuable work, and is known as *Philosophumena*, or philosophizings. But, for all its intrinsic worth, it would never have been used by modern heresy as a "search-light,"

were it not for the fact that, in the last book, the writer makes a virulent personal attack upon St. Callixtus, accusing him of many grave crimes, prominent among which are heresy and the formation, "in antagonism to the Catholic Church," of a schismatical "school." Since St. Hippolytus styles himself a bishop, the inference is natural that he was the leader of a sect in opposition to the generally recognized Pope. It cannot be wondered at that Cardinal Newman and Catholics generally should have pronounced it "simply incredible" that a saint so highly honored by the Roman Church should have been the earliest antipope. But it is the incredible that oftenest happens, and since the thorough investigations made by Dr. Döllinger and others, the Catholic antiquarians have all but unanimously accepted this solution of a mysterious historical riddle. It was neither the first nor the last time in the history of the Church when two saints came into collision; witness Sts. Peter and Paul, Sts. Stephen and Cyprian, Bossuet and Fénelon. In fact, it takes two earnest men to put up a first rate quarrel. It is the misfortune of St. Callixtus that, like St. Peter, he did not acquaint posterity with the merits of his end of the controversy. We know him only through the "search-light" of his literary opponent. But, even thus, his character has not suffered in the estimation of those who can sit as impartial judges of a long-exploded issue. Callixtus, who had been little more than a name in the catalogue of Popes, stands out before us now as a strong personality. It would not be an exaggeration to call him the Hildebrand of his age. Like Hildebrand, he had been for upwards of a score of years the "Papa papae," the power behind the papal chair, guiding and dictating the policy of the Pope with an ability which commanded the respect, whilst it intensified the enmity of his ill-wishers. Like Hildebrand, he was branded by his adversaries as a veritable "fire-brand of hell," the fiendish master and lord of mediocre pontiffs, whom he moulded at will. Like Hildebrand, too, his reputation has been redeemed by the circumstance that we are fairly well acquainted with the controversies in which he was involved. At the then stage in the development of Christian dogma and ethics there were two questions that mainly occupied the attention of thinkers. The first concerned the relation of the Eternal Word to God the Father, the profoundest of all mysteries. As was but natural, at a time when theology was in its infancy and had not yet sharpened its scientific tools, Catholic speculation was drifting about in the endeavor to avoid two dangerous extremes, that known as Sabellianism, which confounded the distinct personality of the Father and the Son, and that known in a later age as Arianism, which denied the very divinity of the Son of God. St. Hippolytus, the friend of Origen, used forms of expression

which, a hundred years later, would be considered favorable to Arianism. Sabellius was already at work formulating his "monarchical" doctrine, to be condemned by St. Callixtus. The fact that Pope Callixtus excommunicated Sabellius, whilst, on the other hand, he is upbraided by St. Hippolytus as refusing to commit himself to either side of the controversy, is a consoling evidence to us that then, as always, the Roman See was guided by the Holy Spirit along the path of truth. For will any one dare assert that the course held by Pope Callixtus has not been finally approved by the entire Catholic world? That a Pope who, so far as we can learn, laid no claim to literary ability, should have held the balance so fairly between antagonistic theologians, is a glorious proof of papal infallibility.

The second question which engrossed the minds of Christians at that early age regarded the proper method of dealing with public sinners. St. Hippolytus, like Tertullian, was an extreme rigorist in morals; in fact, one of the founders of what was later known as the Novatian school. These moralists did not believe in showing any mercy to repentant sinners, and they maintained especially that adulterers should be excluded from church and sacraments until their dying hour. Against these extremists, Callixtus planted himself as a wall of brass. We discover through the "search-light" of St. Hippolytus that he it was who dictated that famous decretal in the time of St. Zephyrinus which roused the bile of Tertullian. Now, dear Mr. Flournoy, tell us who was in the right, Callixtus the humane or Hippolytus the rigorist? One more remark and we are through. St. Hippolytus, we are told, can have known nothing of the Vatican doctrine of papal infallibility or he would not have opposed his opinions to those of the Pontiff. Can anything more silly be dreamt of? Unless (which is possible enough) the two chapters of St. Hippolytus are an interpolation, he looked on himself as Bishop and Callixtus as an intruder who had "formed a school in antagonism to the Church." He could not have any respect for the opinions of one whom he did not consider to be Pope at all. Why then did and does the Roman Church venerate St. Hippolytus? For the same reason that she venerates St. Cyprian, of whom St. Augustine so beautifully says that his glorious martyrdom blotted out the last traces of human infirmity. That extreme clemency of the Church of the Romans, of which St. Callixtus was so noble an exponent, prompted her to remember the transcendent merits of her wayward son, and to consign to the deepest oblivion his temporary lapse. In this case the motto was reversed, and "the good the man did lived after him, the evil was interred with his bones." Farewell to thee and thy "search-light," Mr. Parke P. Flournoy.

THE QUESTION-BOX ANSWERS. Replies to Questions Received at Missions to Non-Catholics. By *Rev. Bertrand Conway*, of the Paulist Fathers. The Catholic Book Exchange, 120 West Sixtieth street, New York.

Recalling the abundance of good books, great and small, which have been published, especially in recent years, to cover what may be called the field of popular apologetics, it might seem that a new volume of similar scope could scarcely possess any distinctive merit. We venture to say that any one entertaining this opinion will reconsider it after a careful inspection of the volume just published by a Paulist Father, old, if not in years, in missionary experience. Within the six hundred pages of this volume, now published with the *Imprimatur* of the late Archbishop Corrigan, will be found a full exposition and defense of Catholic doctrine and discipline, together with straight, concise and effective replies to almost every kind of objection urged by non-Catholics in this country. Its chief and characteristic excellence, however, lies not so much in its extensive range as in the thoroughly appropriate way in which the subjects are treated. Who that has had much to do with outsiders seeking information about the Church has not met with the disappointment of finding that some excellent book which he recommended as just the thing for the mental attitude of some prospective convert, failed to hit the mark? The reason is not far to seek. Many such books are written too much from the insider's point of view. They are admirable statements of doctrine and history for the children of the house; but they do not aid the wanderer who is seeking through devious ways to reach the door from the outside. Their authors too often lack the mental insight and the sympathy requisite to put themselves in the position of the enquirer, and thus to see the obstacles in the distorted perspective in which they appear to him—obstacles sometimes serious, oftener whimsical and imaginary, but none the less serious. No mere logical completeness in the marshalling of invincible arguments will effect much, unless combined with an appreciation of the personal attitude of those to whom they are addressed. Conversions are effected not by abstract statements of abstract truth to an abstract man; but by the application of light to the particular obscurity, misapprehension or perversion that is troubling the concrete individual who is to be dealt with according to his idiosyncrasy. Sometimes it may even be prudent to borrow a hint from Solomon, who tells us to answer a fool according to his folly.

The plan adopted by Father Conway of taking an immense quantity of the queries and objections that, during several years, have been addressed through the question-box to the Paulist Fathers on their missionary campaigns, classifying them and giving replies to them, is certainly the best that could be devised for reaching the non-Cath-

olic mind. Fully equipped by his university training with the science requisite to cover the whole theological and historical field *inoffenso pede*, Father Conway brings his knowledge and experience to bear upon the matter in hand, and always with accuracy and precision. To use a familiar and expressive phrase, he always hits the nail on the head. Two or three apparently typographical errors which have eluded the vigilance of the proof-reader will, we presume, be corrected in a future edition. To all the more important questions is appended a copious list of works for consultation, and, besides the general index of matters there is another of the authors quoted. The worthy result of much industry and knowledge, both theoretical and practical, there is every reason to expect that the book will be the instrument of much spiritual good.

And the practical shape of this will not only be in aiding missionaries in active field work to manage their question-box—a prominent feature of every mission to non-Catholics. It will also place our regular pastors in a position to imitate those of their brethren who have set up that very useful means of reaching our separated friends in the course of parish ministrations. Many parish priests already answer questions at Sunday evening services. Why not all? Father Conway's book will greatly help a favorable answer. It should be noticed that the bound copy sells for one dollar and the paper covered edition at the rate of seven dollars and a half a hundred, thus helping the distribution of the work itself among all classes. Besides its use among priests it is an admirable manual of Catholic doctrine.

ÉTUDES SUR ST. JEROME. Par D. Léon Sanders, O. S. B. Bruxelles et Paris (chez Lecoffre), 1903, p. 394.

There is a letter amongst the correspondence of St. Augustine with St. Jerome which illustrates at once the virile character of the writer and the high estimation in which the author of the Vulgate was held by his contemporaries. St. Augustine is sending his interpretation of a passage from the Epistle of St. James (ii., 10), and asks St. Jerome's opinion thereon. The letter ends thus: "If your learning finds aught to reprehend in this commentary I beg you to write it to me and fear not to correct me. For he were indeed a sorry man who would not wish to hearken to one that hath labored with so much edification and who would not for the great success of your works thank the Lord our God. Therefore if instead of teaching others what I know myself I should rather learn from any one what it is useful for me not to be ignorant of, with how much more reason ought I not to accept with good will that act of charity

at your hands. You whose knowledge hath been an instrument of which the Lord hath made use to facilitate the study of the Sacred Letters beyond what hath been done up to this day."

If the learned bishop of Hyppo indicates in these lines the position of St. Jerome in the biblical world of his time, Leo XIII. voices the corresponding esteem on the part of serious Scriptural scholars in this latter age when in his Encyclical on biblical studies he writes of St. Jerome: *A singulari Bibliorum Scientia magnisque ad eorum usum laboribus nomine Doctoris maxime praeconio Ecclesiae est honestatus*. True it is great progress has been made in biblical science since the fourth century; nevertheless such was the genius, indefatigable patience in research, and acute critical sense of St. Jerome that no one who would understand the Bible can afford to be ignorant of his teaching on its vital problems. Dom Sanders has facilitated in no small degree the student's access to that teaching by the scholarly *Etudes* in the volume at hand. He treats in the first place of the Saint's opinion on that burning question, the inspiration and veracity of the Sacred Writings—a subject of peculiar interest in view of the fact that some scholars appeal to St. Jerome in support of the opinion that the Bible contains some material errors ascribed to ignorance on the part of the sacred writers. The Saint's opinion also on the canonicity of the deuterocanonical books—as to which there have been *tot sententiae quot capita*—and his acceptance of the term *Apochrypha*, especially in connection with the famous Gospel *juxta Hebraeos*: his teaching likewise in regard to the distinction between the Episcopate and the Presbyterate; his attitude towards Origen and the Origenic controversies—all these are discussed at some length and with considerable erudition. Though the direct aim is to reveal the mind of St. Jerome, yet by many apposite side lights and copious bibliographical references the author prepares the way for a study of the several questions in themselves and apart from their relations to St. Jerome. The work has therefore an interest not only for the specialist, but likewise for the general reader who would be liberally informed on the important topics with which it is occupied. This general serviceability is still further enhanced by the brief introductory sketch of the life and works of St. Jerome which prepares the reader for a more intelligent appreciation of the special problems discussed.

"LES SAINTS:" St. Victrice. Par E. Vacandard, p. 186. Ste. Hildegarde. Par Paul Franche, p. 212. La Bienheureuse Marie de l'Incarnation. Par Emmanuel de Broglie, p. 211. Paris: Victor Lecoffre, 90 Rue Bonaparte, 1903.

The latest additions to the well-known series *The Saints*. Each

reflects in its own way a type which while portraying the sublime perfection attained by an individual soul exemplifies no less a special order of instrumental efficiency employed by Divine Providence for the spiritual enlightenment and regeneration not only in the day of the Saint's earthly sojourning, but for all subsequent time.

The first type is that of the Christian bishop—the story of a man who from paganism and the camp of the Roman legions rose to the heroic devotedness of a saintly pastor who shed the lustre of his wisdom and virtue over the early Church in Gaul. The Abbé Vacandard has presented this type in the person of St. Victrice with a sympathy and vividness that make it stand out to the life in the mind of the reader.

The second type is that of the contemplative whom abiding union with God had raised to sublime heights of mystical intuition, and who reflected to the world of her day secrets of the Unseen that are given but seldom even to the chosen heroes of holiness to enjoy. St. Hildegarde was, however, even more than a mystic and a seer of things divine. She wrought above all—and that indeed just by reason of her abiding union with God—a most potent influence on the troubled age in which she lived. M. Frauche treats with marked reserve the legendary features and the mysterious facts of St. Hildegarde's life. He is more explicit and confident in describing the great social work she accomplished, especially in bringing about a reformation in the lives of some ecclesiastical dignitaries of the twelfth century.

The third type is that of the valiant woman who shed the influence of high virtue in the principal spheres of woman's activity—in the home as the ideal wife and mother; in courtly society as an example of true refinement and gentleness of manner, the fragrance of Christian charity; and in the cloister as the model of the religious life. Nothing that the Wise Man wrote in praise of the *Mulier fortis*, but what might as truly be said of Madame Acarie. The Prince de Broglie portrays this heroine of Christian sanctity with that fullness and freshness of color, delicate sense of proportion and true instinct for the supernatural which have made his many other contributions to hagiography warmly appreciated by so many readers in and out of France. As one studies the portrait and realizes that it represents a character of the Reformation days—times when the Church is said to have lapsed so deeply into the universal sink that even the Reformers struggled vainly to drag her forth—one marvels the more that such heroines as St. Frances of Rome, St. Jane Francis de Chantal, St. Teresa and the subject of the present biography could be the daughters of a mother who had lost the fecundity of holiness!

We need hardly say that these three accessions to the series *Les*

Saints are what the French call *well documented*, solidly established on reliable sources, and yet not so congested with erudite detail as to leave no room for an appreciative portrayal of the soul life of their subjects—a characteristic which, we believe, cannot be attributed to all the other companion volumes of the series.

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS 1493-1803. Explorations by Early Navigators, Descriptions of the Islands and their Peoples, their History and Records of the Catholic Missions, as related in contemporaneous Books and Manuscripts, showing the Political, Economic, Commercial and Religious Conditions of those Islands from their earliest relations with European Nations to the beginning of the Nineteenth Century. With maps, portraits and other illustrations. Fifty-five volumes large 8vo., about 325 pages per volume. Vol. 2, 1521-1569; Vol. 3, 1569-1576; Vol. 4, 1576-1582. Edition limited to one thousand numbered sets. Price, \$4.00 net per volume. Cleveland: Arthur H. Clark Co.

The Messrs. Clark's great work on the Philippines is progressing rapidly and successfully. Each volume that comes from the press is an important contribution to the important question that is engaging the attention of the thinking world at the present time and will continue to engage it for many years to come.

In these volumes the true unvarnished history is being written, and the earnest student of the question must come to them, or else spend much time, labor and money in original research before he finds the truth.

Volume 2 deals with the several attempts made to reach the Philippine Islands and establish a settlement there. The stories of Spanish enterprise, bravery and sacrifice for which that nation has always been noted are repeated. The old rivalry with Portugal continues. The anxiety for the eternal welfare of the conquered ever goes hand in hand with the thirst for the temporal advancement of the conqueror.

"In volume 3 the documents presented cover the last three years of Legazpi's administration in the islands, the governorship of Guido de Levezaris, and the beginning of that of Francisco de Sande. In the brief period which we thus far survey, the first decade of Spanish occupation (1565-75), are already disclosed the main elements of the oriental problem of to-day: the conflicting claims of powerful European nations, striving for advantage and monopoly in the rich trade of the East; the eagerness of unscrupulous Europeans to subjugate the wealthy but comparatively defenseless Chinese people, and the efforts of the latter to exclude foreigners from their country; the relations between the dominant whites and the weaker colored races; the characteristics, racial and social, of the various oriental peoples; the Chinese migration to the islands; and the influence of the missionaries."

Volume 4 contains the first official report sent by Governor Francisco de Sande to the home government dated June 7, 1576. It is a very interesting document containing descriptions of the people and their characteristics, customs and habits, and of the country and its climate which he says is healthful for those who live temperately.

Among other interesting documents we find a translation of the Papal Bull establishing the See of Manila dated February 6, 1578.

As the work grows it increases in interest. This will be more noticeable as conditions change and assume the aspect which they bear in modern times. It is to be hoped that all educational institutions in the United States are placing it on their shelves.

PRAELECTIONES PHILOSOPHIAE SCHOLASTICAE. Auctore P. Germano A. S. Stanislae, C. P. P. Vol. I., complectens Logicam et Ideologiam. Pustet Neo-Eboraci, 1903, p. 490.

We have omitted here the words in the title which indicate those for whom these lectures on scholastic philosophy are especially designed, *tironibus facili methodo instituendis accomodatae*. There is always of course a sufficient reason for multiplying text-books when they serve the purpose of the individual professor and his class for whom he prepares them. When, however, the new book appeals to a wider circle than the students for whose benefit it was proximately designed, it should offer some special features which are not just as well represented in preëxisting books of its class. This requirement the present volume will have no difficulty in satisfying. It is ample reason for a book's being that it makes the way to the mastery of a difficult subject particularly easy; and this the work at hand succeeds in doing—easiness being of course measured relatively to the difficulty of scholasticism. There is nothing indeed that is new in the author's method. It is just the analytico-synthetic method, which is as old as Aristotle, nay as old as man; for man's very structure and spontaneous mode of acting is and must be analytico-synthetic. His senses are analytic, his soul and mind synthetic. Both must conjoin to make the man as well as to construct science. The author's success lies in the happy use he has made of this dual method. It stands out in clear relief in the ground lines of his work and it pervades no less markedly every one of its parts. The general matter is divided on the well-known scholastic plan and is then portioned out into lectures (sixty-one in the volume at hand). Every lecture is presented first analytically and then synthetically in the epilogue. The student is thus carried through the detail of each lecture and is then shown the whole in a bird's eye view at its close. Another title of merit not usual to

works of this kind is the synoptical outline of the history of philosophy, which so to say orients the student at the start, and the table of scholastic distinctions and *adagia* at the end which help to develop his insight and precision of thinking. The second volume of the course, which is in press, will embrace *Ontology and Cosmology*, and the third, promised for the near future, *Psychology, Theodicy and Ethics*. This latter volume will doubtless be rather larger than the present, if its vital subjects are to have breathing space.

HISTORIC HIGHWAYS OF AMERICA. The Exploration, Conquest and Development of America, based upon its Highways of War, Commerce and Immigration. By *Archer Butler Hulbert*. Vol. 3, Washington's Road (Nemacolin's Path). The First Chapter of the Old French War, pp. 215. Vol. 4, Braddock's Road and Three Relative Papers, pp. 213, with maps and illustrations. Vol. 5. The Old Glade (Forbes') Road. (Pennsylvania State Road). The Arthur H. Clark Co., Cleveland, Ohio.

We have here the three latest additions to the very attractive series of sixteen volumes which the Clark Company is bringing out under the general title of the "Historical Highways of America." They introduce us to historical persons and events from a new side, and help us to understand the subject better by giving us a fuller knowledge from the new point of view. Some one has said that the history of the world is written in the lives of its great men. He might be tempted to add, if he saw these books, "and on the roads by which they traveled." These roads constantly speak to us of the important characters who built them and used them in war, in commerce, and in social expansion. The History of America as portrayed in the evolution of its highways is very interesting, and the manner in which the story is told by the author of these monographs adds very much to its attractiveness.

Vol. 5 of the series has a special interest for residents and natives of Pennsylvania. When General Edward Braddock landed in Virginia in 1755, one of his first acts in his campaign on the Ohio was to urge Governor Morris to have a road opened westward through Pennsylvania. It was completed only three miles beyond the present town of Bedford, Pa.

In 1758 Brigadier General John Forbes, who had succeeded Braddock after his defeat and death, marched to Bedford on the new road made by Morris, and thence opened along the general alignment of the prehistoric "Trading Path" a new road to the Ohio. He completed his campaign in 1758 at the price of his life.

This road, fortified at Carlisle, Shippensburg, Chambersburg, Loudon, Littleton, Bedford, Ligonier and Pittsburg, became the great military route from the Atlantic seaboard to the trans-Alle-

gheny empire. By it Fort Pitt was relieved during Pontiac's rebellion and the Ohio Indians were brought to terms. Throughout the Revolutionary War this road was the main thoroughfare over which the western forts received ammunition and supplies. In the dark days of the last decade of the eighteenth century, when the Kentucky and Ohio pioneers were fighting for the foothold they had obtained in the West, this road played a vital part.

BREVIARIUM ROMANUM. Romae-Tornacl. Typis Societ. S. Ioannis Ev. 48mo., 1903. Milwaukee: Wiltzius & Co.

This is the latest and one of the best examples of the small breviaries that have come from the press in recent years. Until quite recently a breviary of this size would have been practically useless, because of the small type, but now paper making and type casting have made such splendid advances that the 48mo. breviary is in daily use. This latest addition to the group is excellent in every respect. It is a little longer than the Mechlin book and not so thick. The paper is thin, but it has such a good body that the impression does not go through. A red border gives the page a dressy appearance, and the type is surprisingly large and clear for so small a book.

The reputation of the makers of the book is very high, but readers must not expect to find so few references in it as are found in the larger breviaries from the same house. That is not possible when size is so important a consideration.

Early in October next we may look for the biography of "The Two Kenricks," on which Mr. John J. O'Shea has been engaged for the past three years. The work will be issued in one volume of about 800 pages. So far nothing more than mere sketches of the two great prelates have appeared. Mr. O'Shea's work will be full, and its authenticity is settled by the fact that the materials have been mainly gathered from the respective archives of Philadelphia, Baltimore and St. Louis—the letters of the brothers themselves and their many friends. His Grace the Archbishop of Philadelphia has gone over the whole work minutely, and will furnish an introduction to the same. The Very Rev. Canon O'Hanlon, who was for many years connected with the late Archbishop Peter Richard Kenrick in St. Louis, has given the author much most valuable material for his work. It will be published in Philadelphia, by Mr. John J. McVey.

Books Received.

- DE MATRIMONIO. Ad Usum Scholarum ex Summa Theologiae Moralis exprimendum curavit H. Noldin, S. J., S. Theologiae Professor in Universitate Oenipontana. 8vo., pp. 218. Neo Ebor: Pustet & Co.
- POLITICAL AND MORAL ESSAYS. By *Joseph Rickaby, S. J.*, B. Sc. Oxon. 8vo., pp. 298. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- INTROBO. A series of detached readings on the Entrance Versicles of the Ecclesiastical year. By *Rev. Cornelius Clifford*, chaplain to the Religious of the Sacred Heart of Elmhurst. 12mo., pp. 304. New York: Cathedral Library Association, 534 Amsterdam avenue.
- HELPS TO A SPIRITUAL LIFE. For Religious and for all persons in the world who desire to serve God fervently. From the German of *Rev. Joseph Schneider, S. J.*, with additions by *Rev. Ferreol Girardy, C. SS. R.* 12mo., pp. viii.-257. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- ST. MARGARET OF CORTONA, THE MAIDEN OF THE SERAPHIC ORDER. By *Rev. Leopold de Chérancé, O. S. F. C.* Translated by *R. F. O'Connor*. 12mo., pp. xxv.-256 illustrated. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- THE SAINTS. St. Teresa (1515-1582). By *Henri Joly*. Translated by *Emily M. Waller*. 12mo., pp. 265. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- THE ART OF LIFE. An Essay. By *Frederick Charles Kolbe, D. D.*, of St. Mary's, Capetown. 12mo., pp. 109. Published by Catholic Truth Society of Ireland. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- WREATHS OF SONG FROM A COURSE OF DIVINITY. By the Author of "Wreaths of Song From Courses of Philosophy." 12mo., pp. 80. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son.
- THE CITY OF PEACE. By those who have entered it. 12mo., pp. 149. New York: Benziger Brothers. (Catholic Truth Society of Ireland.)
- THE UNTRAINED NURSE. By a Graduate of Bellevue Hospital, New York City. 16mo., pp. 220. Boston: Angel Guardian Press.
- A ROYAL SON AND MOTHER. By the *Baroness Pauline von Hügel*. 16mo., pp. 126, with portrait. Notre Dame: Ave Maria.
- HERO STORIES FROM AMERICAN HISTORY, for Elementary Schools. By *Albert F. Blaisdell* and *Francis K. Ball*. 12mo., pp. 259, illustrated. Boston: Ginn & Co.
- DISCOURSES ON WAR. By *William Ellery Channing*. With introduction by *Edwin D. Mead*. 12mo., pp. lxi.-229. Boston: Ginn & Co.
- THE UNRAVELING OF A TANGLE. By *Marion Ames Taggart*. 8vo., pp. 146.
- THE TALISMAN. By *Anna T. Sadlier*. 8vo., pp. 186.
- THE PILLINOTON HEIR. By *Anna T. Sadlier*. 8vo., pp. 212, illustrated.
- THE SHERIFF OF THE BEECH FORK. A Story of Kentucky. By *Henry S. Spalding, S. J.* 8vo., pp. 223.
- HARRY RUSSELL. By *Rev. J. E. Copus, S. J.* 12mo., pp. 229. New York: Benziger Brothers.
- BACK TO ROME. By "Scrutator." 12mo., pp. 224. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1903. Net, \$1.00.
- INSTINCT AND INTELLIGENCE IN THE ANIMAL KINGDOM. By *Rev. E. Wassmann, S. J.* 12mo., pp. x., 171. B. Herder: St. Louis, Mo., 1903. Net, \$1.00.
- ST. EDMUND, ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY. Arranged by *Bernard Ward*. 12mo., pp. xx., 290. B. Herder: St. Louis, Mo., 1903. Net, \$1.60.
- THE FRIENDSHIPS OF JESUS. By *Rev. M. J. Olivier, O. P.* 12mo., pp. 543. B. Herder: St. Louis, Mo., 1903. Net, \$1.50.
- THE GIFT OF PENTECOST. By *Fr. Meschler, S. J.* 12mo., pp. xi., 505. B. Herder: St. Louis, Mo., 1903. Net, \$1.60.
- CATHOLIC LONDON MISSIONS. By *Johanna H. Harting*. 12mo., pp. xi., 270. B. Herder: St. Louis, Mo., 1903. Net, \$2.00.
- THE YOUNG CHRISTIAN TEACHER ENCOURAGED. By *B. C. G.* 12mo., pp. xxii., 381. B. Herder: St. Louis, Mo., 1903. Net, \$1.25.
- GLAUBEN UND MISSEN. Von *Victor Cathrein, S. J.* An essay on the relations between faith and science. 12mo., pp. vi., 245. B. Herder: St. Louis, Mo., 1903. Net, 85 cents.
- JESUIT EDUCATION. By *R. Schwickerath, S. J.* 12mo., pp. xv., 687. B. Herder: St. Louis, Mo., 1903. Net, \$1.75.
- HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY. By *William Turner, S. T. D.* 12mo., pp. x., 674. Ginn & Co., Boston, Mass., 1903.
- DIE KATHOLISCHE KIRCHE IN ARMENIEN. A history of the Catholic Church in Armenia from its foundation to its separation from the Holy See. By *Simon Weber, D. D.*, professor apologetics University of Freiburg. 12mo., pp. 532. B. Herder: St. Louis, Mo., 1903. Net, \$3.10.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW

"Contributors to the *QUARTERLY* will be allowed all proper freedom in the expression of their thoughts outside the domain of defined doctrines, the *REVIEW* not holding itself responsible for the individual opinions of its contributors."

(Extract from Salutory, July, 1890)

VOL. XXVIII.—OCTOBER, 1903—No. 112.

MOST REV. PATRICK JOHN RYAN, D. D., LL. D., FIFTY
YEARS A PRIEST.

ON SEPTEMBER 8, 1903, Most Rev. Patrick John Ryan, D. D., LL. D., completed his fiftieth year in the Priesthood.

It is fitting that this event should be recorded here, because for the past thirteen years Archbishop Ryan has been Editor-in-chief of *The American Catholic Quarterly Review*. When he arrived in this diocese, in 1884, he found the *Review* flourishing under the management of Mr. Charles Hardy, its owner, and under the editorial direction of Right Rev. Monsignor Corcoran. Always a man of letters and fully alive to the value of such a publication, which from its beginning, in 1876, had raised the standard of Catholic periodical literature to the highest point, the Archbishop encouraged the faithful, enthusiastic and self-sacrificing owner and the learned and devoted editor by every means in his power.

When Monsignor Corcoran died, in 1889, Mr. Hardy induced the Archbishop to take the chair of Editor-in-chief. He did so most reluctantly, because the duties of Archbishop in so large a diocese already weighed heavily upon him, and because he would not assume any office if he could not fulfil its obligations. For the sake of Catholic truth he consented, and in his salutory, in April, 1890, announced, after paying glowing tribute to his illustrious predecessor, that he should follow in his footsteps. The aims of the *Quarterly* had been so admirably set forth in the beginning, and the means adopted to attain them had proved so completely adequate, that he would be rash indeed who would turn aside from the one or neglect the other.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1902, by P. J. Ryan, in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

Time has proved the wisdom of this course. Under the wise direction of Archbishop Ryan, the *Quarterly* has continued to fulfil the mission assigned to it in the beginning. It has at all times explained and defended the Catholic theory of revealed Truth; it has shown the practical development and working of Catholic principle in the history of the world; it has devoted no small number of its pages to the service of philosophy and science; it has not neglected politics, using that world in its higher sense; and true to each part of its name, it has always given special attention to the origin and progress of the Catholic Church in America.

The success of the *Review* must be attributed first of all and principally to him. He chose the assistant editors, he directed them in their labors, his prudence guided them in time of doubt and uncertainty, his patience sustained them in time of trial, his experience warned them in time of danger, and his learning led them in time of darkness.

The American Catholic Quarterly Review owes a deep debt of gratitude to Most Rev. Archbishop Ryan, and wishes to record it in this year of jubilee, when all the golden deeds of that fruitful half century are being woven into a beautiful historical tapestry by the love of all his spiritual children.

LEO XIII.

THE illustrious Pontiff who on the 20th of July passed away to eternal rest has filled so large a place in the thoughts of men during a quarter of a century that it is difficult to appreciate to the full the outcome of his acts and the results of his influence in relation to the history of the world. The historian of a future day will apportion him the place he shall occupy in the annals of the Church and of the world, and allot to him his grade in the glorious line of great Pontiffs who have occupied the Chair of Saint Peter. He is too near our day, and the memory of him and of his works so fill the thoughts of his contemporaries that it is difficult to appreciate them with impartiality. His life and work are so familiar, either wholly or in part, to the men of this age that they impress the judgment and affect the sense of historic perspective. All the world feels poorer for his loss. He was known to all the world. The many hundreds of thousands of men and women from every civilized land under heaven who visited Rome either as pilgrims or tourists during the twenty-five years of his Pontificate strove to see him face to face, and had their wish gratified. And the many millions who have not had this privilege knew his name and acknowledged his virtues and were aware of the efforts he made to procure justice for the oppressed and to inculcate charity and peace among men and nations.

The life of Leo XIII. embraces almost a whole century, and that one of the most notable centuries in modern history. When he was born (2d March, 1810) the great Napoleon was at the zenith of his power, and was consolidating his position by his marriage with the Archduchess Maria Louisa, daughter of Francis II., Emperor of Austria. A year older than the King of Rome, the future Leo XIII. was a student in the Roman College, writing notable essays and pursuing his studies, when, in the summer of 1832, this heir to the empty title lay dying at Schönbrunn. Leo XIII. was in his sixth year when the Emperor Napoleon was hopelessly defeated at Waterloo, and he was a student eleven years old, attending the Jesuit College at Viterbo, when Napoleon passed away, an exile and a prisoner of the English Government at Longwood in the Island of St. Helena. He was contemporary with the greatest men of the century, being three months younger than Mr. Gladstone and a year younger than Abraham Lincoln; he was four years older than Bismarck and twelve years older than General Grant—all of whom he outlived. He had seen the fall of the first French Empire, and the rise and fall of the second, with intermediate Monarchy and

Republic. In his country home in the neighborhood of Carpineto, amidst the Lepine Hills, he may have heard in his childhood rumors of the events that shook the world and of the deeds enacted by the men who were most prominent in the first quarter of the nineteenth century. He lived to become acquainted with the men who were foremost at its close, and he brought its memories into the new century. The story of his career, embracing so lengthy and changeful a period of human history, in much of which he took a conspicuous part, employing his influence for the good of mankind, possesses more than ordinary interest to every thinking man.

The time in which the future Pope opened his eyes upon the world was of paramount importance in the history of the Church. The atmosphere in which he grew up and lived in his early years made its impression on his intellect and character. He came of a hardy, healthy stock, occupying a lonely town set deep amidst the hills, and from them he inherited the vigor and nervous enduring force that made him the wonder of all who saw him in his later years. Gioacchino Pecci, as he afterwards called himself, selecting this name from those given him at baptism: Gioacchino, Vincenzo—the name his mother preferred—Raffaele and Luigi—was the sixth child and fourth son of Colonel Ludovico Pecci and Anna Prosperi Buzi his wife; and he was born at Carpineto, a little mountain town situated amidst the Lepine Hills and in the Diocese of Anagni. The name of Anagni is noted in history as a nursery of Popes, four occupants of the Papal Chair during the thirteenth century having come from this diocese: Innocent III., Gregory IX., Alexander IV. and Boniface VIII. It is also raised into world-wide renown in the pages of Dante's "*Divina Commedia*," where he describes the outrages wrought on Pope Boniface VIII. by the French and the Colonna faction, when the "vinegar and gall" were renewed,

And Christ in his own Vicar captive made.

The family of the Peccis, which originally came from Cortona, settled in Siena about the year 1300, and there became rich and illustrious. Members of the family filled positions of importance in that city, and the Pecci Palace, still standing there, bespeaks their ancient glory. One of them, Giovanni Pecci, was Bishop of Grosseto, a poet and author of a life of Saint Catherine of Siena. His tomb in the Cathedral of his native place is visited chiefly because it was carved by Donatello. In 1340 another one of the family, Benvenuto, was enrolled in the Order of the Knights of Malta, and at this period that was the most warlike order in Europe. Early in the fifteenth century Giacomo Pecci received into his house Pope Martin V. when passing through Siena, and lent him 25,000 florins,

receiving in pledge the Castle of Spoleto. Another of the family, Pietro Pecci, who was born in Spain, became a member of the Hermits of Saint Jerome, founded by his grandfather, and was declared Blessed. Margaret Pecci, of the Servites of Mary, was also beatified, and her portrait in the brown habit of her order hangs in the bedroom occupied by Gioacchino Pecci in Carpineto. The young Giacchino, while he was still a student at the Accademia Ecclesiastica at Rome was gathering materials for an elaborate genealogical tree founded on the best authors, on family traditions and documents. On his mother's side he was related to the celebrated Cola di Rienzi. Angelo Rienzi, son of the last of the Roman Tribunes, after his father's death took refuge at Cori, where he changed his name into that of Prosperi; and from him descended Anna Prosperi Buzi, mother of Leo XIII. A natural and just pride in his ancestry, and a special devotion to the saintly members of his race, inspired his acts and uplifted his thoughts.

The education of young Gioacchino Pecci, begun at home under the wisest and tenderest of teachers, was continued at Rome, to which the child was sent at the age of seven. A year later he and his brother Joseph, nearly three years his elder, were sent to the Jesuits' College at Viterbo. This order had been restored and was beginning again its great teaching mission. On the feast of St. Aloysius, in the year 1821, Gioacchino Pecci made his first Communion in the church of the college. Now his letters begin, and the distinction and stateliness of thought and phrase which marked his writings during his whole life begin to appear. Nothing reveals better than the familiar spontaneous letters written for the occasion the character of an individual. At the age of ten young Pecci writes to his father: "Pray for me and for my brother, and tell mamma that I have received the Life of St. Francis of Assisi, which I asked from her, and also that of St. Louis." The clear and elegant handwriting, resembling print, which begins hesitatingly in his earliest letters and afterwards becomes more accurate, is maintained throughout his life. The careful mode in which his letters are written may be taken as an indication of his faculty for taking pains and for expressing the clearness and accuracy of his thought in the clearest form. It is in this early period also that he is first taken by the desire of writing Latin verses, and in a letter to his mother in the April of 1820, asking her to come and see himself and his brother, he adds: "On this occasion I would also wish that you would procure me the 'Regia Parnassi' to teach me to make Latin verse."

The record of great men's school days is always interesting. There are to be seen the first signs of the working of that mind which, in its after development, arrests the attention of the world. While he asked his mother to supply him with the "Regia Parnassi,"

he thanked her for the *pigne*—a sort of pie—which she had sent him. He outgrew his love for *pigne*, but the habit of making Latin verses remained with him even to the end. “To write in an idiom which has passed away in a really personal style,” wrote M. Georges Goyan, “gives the effect of an impossibility attempted. Leo XIII. achieved it. He does not fulfil the task of an editor in Latin; nineteen centuries after the Incarnation the Pope is a Latin author. His early education began this miracle; his coming to the Pontifical throne finished it. Previous to assuming the Tiara he possessed the skill and the impeccable elegance of the humanist; but upon the tablets of a scholar, however learned he may be, Latin remains a dead language. . . . Leo XIII. in becoming Pope was established in the only place in the world where this language remained alive. . . . The Holy See prolongs the posthumous existence of the old language in *saecula saeculorum*.” He had no idea that he was in any way specially gifted. To his brother at Carpineto he writes, in his twelfth year, that the prizes which his “very small capacity” enabled him to obtain were not won “without some difficulty.” In his eighteenth year while he was in the Roman College he wrote to his brother at home: “My mind is turned towards the most arduous mathematical calculations. I study the laws which Divine Wisdom has established over bodies and over the physical world. In chemistry I observe the phenomena of Nature. In astronomy I measure the distances of the planets and of the solar disc, or again I admire the grandeur of their orb and the majesty of their regular revolution. Such is my life, in a restricted circle of choice friends.”

It is in his eighteenth year also that we find his first mention of Saint Thomas Aquinas, whose works and system he will in after years bring into use and honor by his authority as Sovereign Pontiff. He writes to his brother Carlo, at Carpineto: “Do me the favor of sending as soon as possible by the first occasion the ‘Summa Theologica’ of St. Thomas. . . . If by chance you should also find there some work on Dogmatic—but not on Moral—you would do me a pleasure to send it at your convenience. But St. Thomas I ask of you at once; he is the archimandrite of theologians.” Half a century later, on the 4th of August, 1879, the philosophic system of this “archimandrite of theologians,” restored to all its purity, was recommended to the study of the Catholic clergy especially, in the Pontifical Encyclical “Aeterni Patris.” “The thoughts of youth are long, long thoughts,” says the poet. In the case of Gioacchino Pecci, the aftermath of great and noble works which he accomplished is indicated in the thoughts and convictions of his youth, ripening through the years of his manhood, and coming forth in power and

majesty in his mature old age. The Rev. H. T. Henry, of Overbrook Seminary, in his "Poems, Charades, Inscriptions of Leo XIII.," has made it evident that from the age of twelve, when his first Latin verses are printed, down to the last, few years have passed without some Latin verse or poem. So is it in other cases. The admiration for St. Thomas Aquinas which he has as a youth becomes stronger as the years go on, and in Perugia, where he was Archbishop, he, in 1858, drew up the regulations for an Accademia of St. Thomas Aquinas, which, however, in consequence of the vicissitudes of the times, could not be established until 1872. This Accademia was a union of priests with the object of the study of the works of the Angelic Doctor. The matters to be treated of, according to the new regulations of 1872, are theological and philosophical in relation to the new errors against the faith and against sound philosophy; deduced always from the works of the Angelic Doctor, which are studied during the year. In 1875, at the head of the Bishops of Umbria, the Cardinal Archbishop of Perugia addresses a request to Pope Pius IX. asking that St. Thomas Aquinas may be constituted the Patron of Catholic Colleges and Universities. And, in 1880, a non-Catholic writer, speaking of the Papal Encyclical on the Restoration of Christian Philosophy in Catholic Universities, according to the mind of St. Thomas Aquinas, the Angelic Doctor, said: "Of the innumerable testimonies to the impression left by this remarkable man on the mind of Western Christendom, the recent Encyclical Letter of Pope Leo XIII. may well be esteemed the most noteworthy, and not least for the air of anachronism that hangs about it." The Encyclical was soon followed by a letter which Leo XIII. addressed to Cardinal de Luca, Prefect of the Congregation of Studies, announcing his intention of founding in Rome an Accademia with the object of defending and explaining the doctrine of St. Thomas; and he announced also his project of having a new and complete edition of the works of the Angelic Doctor published. During the twenty-four years that have elapsed since that letter was written thirteen huge tomes of St. Thomas have been published, and from fourteen to fifteen years more, at the present rate of progress, will be required for the completion of the work. These are the essential outcome of the conviction of young Pecci in 1828 when he became acquainted with "the archimandrite of theologians!"

It is about this period also that his letters begin to be concerned with the events of the time and to constitute a record of the men who were prominent in the Rome of these days. The letters were intended to enlighten his brothers at Carpineto, in the great dearth of newspapers then prevailing, what was occurring in Rome. He, on the 20th of February, 1829, writes a letter in a shoemaker's

workshop, "because the post was about to close," describing the death of Pope Leo XII. "Without other preamble," he writes, "I begin then the series of these letters, warning you that I will treat only of the election of the new Roman Pontiff." It is always a matter of supreme interest to learn who the new Pope may be, and what he has been in the past, as a hint of what he may be in the future. The same anxiety has prevailed during the Conclave that succeeded the death of Leo XIII., as he himself records in that succeeding the death of Leo XII. "At last, thanks be to God," he writes, "there is a new Pontiff, a new Bishop of Rome!" He had already related the gossip of the Conclave. "In the Conclave no one holds to Pacca any more. De Gregorio is quite *papabile*; a good number of Cardinals give him their votes and do not *accede* for any other. Many engagements sustain the party of Castiglioni, which is supported by Albani and his followers. Cardinals Cristaldi and Cappellari [who afterwards became Pope Gregory XVI.] continue to gain votes." Such are a few of the notes in the letter sent by this most observing and well informed youth of nineteen to his friends in Carpineto. Of the new Pope, Castiglioni, who took the name of Pius VIII., this young student wrote: "He has a wry neck, and seems to dance when he walks!" And he adds: "I think I have heard formerly that this Castiglioni, being Vicar General under Mgr. Devoti, Bishop of Anagni, had stopped at our house in Carpineto. If one was certain of this it would be a favorable occasion to inscribe on the walls of our house so happy an event. Find out if it is true; for papa will certainly have preserved the memory of it."

The day-by-day life of Rome at a most interesting and little-known period is vividly described in these letters of an observant young student. The capacity for appreciating the qualities of men, and for ranging them according to their genuine abilities, is shown by this young man from time to time. "On Sunday, the 7th (April, 1829), the feast of St. Vincent, there took place in St. Peter's the solemn Coronation," he says, "of which I was able, to my great satisfaction, to observe all the particulars, all the ceremonial in use in such circumstance." One might almost say that destiny was leading him, and that he was being instructed unconsciously in the ceremonial of which he was to be the object forty-nine years later. There was no one more particular than he in the rigorous fulfilment of ceremonial when it came his turn to be Pope, and evidently he watched with keen eyes the ceremonies of the coronation of Pope Pius VIII. The historical memories of the early half of the last century, so little known nowadays, are enlivened by the remarks on current events in the letters of Gioacchino Pecci. He says, in one letter,

that his departure home to Carpineto is deferred in order that he may be present at the arrival of the King of Naples, who will pass some days at Rome with his daughter Cristina, the future Queen of Spain. "He will dwell in a semi-official fashion," he writes, "in the palace of the Duke of Lucca, as in a hotel. There will be given to their Majesties, during their sojourn, some fêtes and diversions which I may be able to recount to you afterwards."

In the following year, by the death of Pius VIII., he has another Conclave to tell of. Writing on the 14th of December, 1830, he says: "Yesterday it was said the Cardinals would not go in procession from S. Silvestro to the Quirinal, according to custom. With regard to so extraordinary a determination some attributed it to the rainy weather, others put forth as a pretext the discovery of a conspiracy tending to disturb the actual political situation in Rome. The son of Hortense and of Jerome [Louis, rather] Bonaparte, the Noble Guard Troili, Ernesto Gozzano and many Frenchmen are mentioned by everybody as the authors of this conspiracy. But just at this moment I have learned that the news is false. The Cardinals will enter processionally into Conclave according to custom." The son of Hortense and Louis Bonaparte, King of Holland, became known to fame afterwards as Napoleon III., Emperor of the French. He had served his apprenticeship as a conspirator in Italy, and was so bound to the revolutionary party there that it was only by his assistance to their advancement, even to the seizure of Rome, that his life was spared.

The election of Gregory XVI. followed, and the young Pecci, now reaching his majority and with a keenness of judgment far beyond his years, relates the event to his brother in Carpineto. There were few present, he says, at the Quirinal, where the Conclave was held, when the announcement was made, but when the cannon thundered forth the glad tidings an innumerable multitude ascended to the Quirinal. "It was then that the new Pontiff, surrounded by Cardinals, was brought, against habitual usage, into the great *loggia*, or balcony, and blessed the immense crowd which received him with the greatest acclamations." When Leo XIII. did not give his blessing from the external *loggia* of St. Peter's, and when this example was followed by Pope Pius X., it was said that political feeling restrained them; this letter of young Pecci recording Pope Gregory's coming to the Quirinal *loggia* describes it as contrary to habitual usage. Continuing to tell his friends in Carpineto the gossip prevailing in Rome, he relates how Cardinal Micara protested in Conclave against the election of Cappellari (Gregory XVI.), who, "though very worthy of the Sovereign Pontificate, was none the less an Austrian subject." And immediately after he adds: "The revo-

lution is propagated in the other Legations of Forli, Ferrara and Ravenna." He fills many pages with a concise and vivid chronicle of the attempt at revolution made in Rome, and how it was obviated. Of one of the Napoleons—Napoleon Bonaparte, brother of Louis, afterwards Emperor of the French—he writes in March, 1831: "It is said and affirmed that the son of Louis Bonaparte, who made common cause with the insurgents, has just died at Perugia from a cold which carried him off in five days." The actual fact was, however, that he died at a small hotel in Forli from an attack of measles, his mother, Queen Hortense, assisting and nursing him. Thus this young ecclesiastical student in the Rome of Pope Gregory's early years had his eyes and ears open, and acquired an acquaintance with the mode of governing and dealing with state difficulties which he turned to good account afterwards. On one occasion he laments his illness, which interrupts "the free course of studies, my sole care." In 1832 he is made a shepherd of Arcadia, that ancient literary Accademia of Rome, and receives the name of Neander Heracleus, which shines in the records of the Accademia even till now. He has an interest even in English politics, and notes that the Duke of Wellington has not been able to form a new ministry. Again, he turns to literature, describing the "Dialogues" of Count Leopardi as above all criticism. But his chief preoccupation, outside of his studies, is the political situation. He rejoices at the news communicated to him by his uncle Antonio of the inscription of the Pecci family to the generous nobility of Anagni; but it is not for "ephemeral vanity" that he rejoices, but that nothing now is opposed to his admission into the Academy of Noble Ecclesiastics. This Academy, which is a nursery of Cardinals, is neither a seminary nor a college, but a free institution in which young ecclesiastical students of noble birth are received, and who while following the courses of theology and philosophy, received also a special instruction comprising administrative and diplomatic sciences. It was natural that such a student of government in action, as Pecci proved himself to be, should desire to become acquainted with the principles that regulate government and the relations of one power with another.

In 1833 he is only four days at Carpineto when he writes that this year is entirely to be consecrated to his studies, "and study agrees ill with noise and fêtes. Study has need of a certain solitude." The idea of a concursus or dispute "on all theology, in presence of the Sovereign Pontiff," comes to him, but it intimidates him greatly. But the rumor of his intention has spread abroad. Pacca knows it, and rejoices at it, and encourages him. It is an expensive display, and Pecci finds that he cannot do it for less than 700 crowns, perhaps

more. "Di Pietro," he says, "has devoted nearly 3,000 crowns to it at the Apollinare; Cullen [afterwards Archbishop of Dublin and Cardinal], about 1,000 at the Propaganda; Arnaldi, at least 800 at the Sapienza; these are the last disputants of theses dedicated to the Pope, two to Leo XII. and one to Pius VIII." His studies continue to be his great preoccupation. In 1835 he writes to Carpineto that a dissertation in which he had taken part with many Roman abbés, and which he wrote for an extraordinary *conkursus* on Public Ecclesiastical Law, won for him from the Pious Union of St. Paul the majority of votes and the prize. The prize was thirty sequins. The subject was that of "Immediate Appeal to the Sovereign Pontiff in Person." That great *conkursus*, about which he was so anxious, was held in the September of this year, Cardinal Sala presiding at it. "It succeeded very well," he wrote. His career began shortly after this. In 1837, on the 6th of February, he was made one of Pope Gregory XVI.'s Domestic Prelates. A few months later, by a letter from the Secretary of State, his appointment as Ponente del Buon Governo is announced to him. With the sincerity that he was accustomed to use in speaking to his relatives of his affairs he declares that since the day on which in order to respond to the desire of his father, he entered upon the career which he was pursuing, he had only one object in view: to employ all his efforts and all laudable conduct to advance in the hierarchical posts of the prelature, "and that our family, profiting by such lustre and credit, which, thanks be to God! has not failed it to this hour, may increase its just reputation in the country." This is the noble ambition that inspires him; later a new spirit and aim take possession of him. He had received the order of sub-deacon on the 17th of December of this same year, and the diaconate on Christmas Eve. "If it please God," he writes, "I will, by the hands of His Eminence Cardinal Odescalchi, be ordained priest on the last day of the year. Thus I shall inaugurate the new year by ascending the holy altar." In the little chapel of St. Stanislaus in the novitiate of the Jesuits at S. Andrea del Quirinale, at 5 in the morning of January 1, 1838, he celebrated his first Mass. "I am filled with joy," he wrote to Cardinal Sala on the following day, "and with all my heart I bless God, who, after having invested me with so sublime a dignity, accords to me besides the consolation of this peace and spiritual sweetness which *exsuperat omnem sensum*." In asking previously for the prayers of Cardinal Sala he expressed his desire to be a "true priest, and to be able to serve God and concur zealously to His glory, and to do so really in the sense in which St. Ignatius understood it and in which his spiritual sons, among whom I have had the good fortune to live, understood it." And he had a strong inclina-

tion to abandon the world and to give himself up wholly to the spiritual life; he would have become a Jesuit if he had been able to recognize within him the special vocation necessary for that state. These revelations of the inmost thoughts and aspirations of the young ecclesiastic who has entered upon an administrative and political career in the service of the Church possess great interest in view of his after life. The sincerity and devotion of Monsignor Gioacchino continue with him throughout his life. As the child is father to the man, so, in his case, the young prelate is father to the aged Pope. It was about this period also that he entered upon that severe *régime* of life which he carried through to the end. When the cholera of 1837 was raging in Rome, and numbers were dying daily, the young Pecci attended the sick with devotion and self-sacrifice. At the height of the summer heats he wrote to his brother: "I have never enjoyed a better or more perfect state of health than at present. I owe this to the *régime* of regular life which I have imposed upon myself." Sixty years later he told the secret in his "Poem on Frugality and Long Life," which was translated by such masters of verse as Andrew Lang and Rev. H. T. Henry, and which is worthy of its author.

In 1838 a despatch from Cardinal Gamberini, Secretary of State, to Monsignor Pecci announced that the Pope had raised the young prelate from the charge of Ponente of the Sacred Congregation of the Buon Governo to that of Delegate Apostolic of the Province of Benevento. This marks the beginning of a career for which his past studies and labors had prepared him. Heretofore he is of Carpineto; henceforth the world is before him. "One comprehends Leo XIII. only in his native country," wrote M. Boyer d'Agen in the Pecci album at Carpineto a few years ago; "mountains, high as his thoughts; a solitude, profound as his sentiments. The rocks of Carpineto preserve the first page of a great life, of which the deserts of Rome will have but the last page."

The task which Mgr. Pecci had to fulfil in Benevento was of peculiar difficulty. Here brigandage had been brought to the perfection of a fine art, and contraband practices were rife all over the land. The government which the new Delegate aimed at establishing was based on the complete abolition of both these irregularities. On his arrival here Mgr. Pecci was brought to death's door by a malignant fever, which kept him a month in bed and a second month in convalescence. In his third month here he began to gather up the tangled skein of former neglect or weakness, and strove to put matters into order and regularity. It was here that a frequently quoted incident occurred. A provincial grandee called on the Delegate one day to reproach him with the violation of antique privileges

belonging to him in his quality as Marquis. Rising to the occasion the Marquis threatened the Delegate, saying he would proceed to Rome and return with the decree suspending the Delegate from his functions. "Very well, sir marquis," replied the pale and delicate-looking Delegate, "but remember that before reaching the Vatican you have to pass by the Castle of St. Angelo." This castle was then used as a prison. The Marquis postponed his journey. The attitude of Mgr. Pecci to his work at Benevento is described by himself in a letter to his brother, Giovanni Battista. "The affairs of the province are going on regularly," he writes. "The opinion of the majority, that is, of the people, is favorable to me. My guide in every matter is conscience and duty; my system, a complete freedom from all kinds of shackles; and I am on the alert for every cabal and each intrigue. This sort of tactics is strange to the nobles and others accustomed to a different system. It has none the less merited for me the title of a lover of justice, and has satisfied my conscience all the more. This will make me never forsake it." "Conscience and duty!" These are the principles that sustain him in this most difficult situation. With these as guides, whatsoever his fate, he is always master of himself.

During the period of his delegation in Benevento he paid a visit to the celebrated monastery of Monte Cassino. In the visitors' book for the year 1839 the traveler may read at the top of a page in that old-fashioned, compressed and elegant script which was specially his, his name and title: "Gioacchino Pecci, Pontifical Delegate to Benevento, 24th April, 1839." He stayed at the monastery eight days, and at all times, especially after he became Pope, he showed a paternal interest in the Benedictines of Monte Cassino. The admiration which he had in 1839 for the famous monastery of Monte Cassino found new expression sixty-four years later, when he contributed largely to the construction of an international college of Benedictines dedicated to S. Anselm and erected on the Aventine Hill at Rome. "With this month of March," he wrote in 1841, "begins the fourth year of my Delegation at Benevento. Will it be the last? Let us hope so." His work was accomplished; peace prevailed throughout the delegation and industries were revived. In June of this year he was nominated to the delegation, but that was soon changed for the more important one of Perugia. The love of justice, the fulfilment of duty according to his conscience, which had been the principles of his conduct in Benevento, directed his action in Perugia and brought him the respect of the people. Pope Gregory XVI. made a tour through the States of the Church, and Mgr. Pecci had news of his coming to Perugia twenty days previously. In these twenty days, by his energy and care, a new

road, the Via Gregoriana, was made from the valley below into the city, so that the Pope might make the ascent with greater ease. The compliment which the Pontiff paid to the Delegate has become historic: "In my journey I have been received in some places as a friar; in several others fittingly, but as a Cardinal; but in Ancona and Perugia I have been received really as a Sovereign!" The thoroughness that distinguished all the work that Mgr. Pecci undertook received its praise in these words.

In January, 1843, when he had received the announcement of his appointment as Nuncio Apostolic to Brussels, he wrote to his brother Charles at Carpineto giving him the official notification of it; he adds: "Oh! if only our good parents were still living! I cannot think of it without feeling my heart bleed." In February he was consecrated titular Archbishop of Damietta, and in March he set out for his mission. On his journey, which occupied three weeks, he learned sufficient French to converse in this language on his arrival in Brussels. A plain statement made concerning the Nuncio to Belgium was that sent by M. Noyer, Belgian Charge d'Affaires at Rome, to Bishop, afterwards Cardinal Wiseman: "Mgr. Pecci is a man of excellent character, of a calm and staid mind and of exemplary piety. With his great desire of doing good I do not doubt that Mgr. Pecci may satisfy all the exigencies of his position." His work here was accomplished with a success like to that achieved in Benevento and Perugia. The most important event that occurred during his stay here was, he writes, the arrival of the Queen of England in Belgium on a visit to her uncle, King Leopold. The entrance of the Queen into Brussels was magnificent, he wrote, and in the evening the illuminations were superb. "To the banquet of the sovereigns the diplomatic corps was also invited. Queen Victoria sat at the middle of the table, between the King and Queen of the Belgians. As I was placed at the side of them, I had an opportunity of observing the royal guests and of speaking a few words to them. The Queen of England is not tall, her expression is vivacious." Three years later, when his Nunciature was at an end, Mgr. Pecci visited England, heard O'Connell in the House of Commons, was presented again to the Queen and passed a month in London. He was the bearer of a letter from King Leopold I. to Pope Gregory XVI., in which the King recommended Archbishop Pecci to the benevolent protection of His Holiness. "He has merit in every point of view," wrote the King, "for I have rarely seen a more sincere devotion to duty, intentions more pure and actions more upright." Thus it is that the goodness and force of character, the conscientious fulfilment of duty which was the rule of his life, impressed those who were acquainted with him, and made them

desirous of furthering him in his career. When Mgr. Pecci reached Rome Gregory XVI. was dead. The returning Nuncio met with Cardinal Mastai Ferretti and had a lengthy conversation with him on the actual situation of the Church. "The two future Popes," writes M. Julien de Narfon, "exchanged views upon the government of souls; curious meeting and most interesting conversation, if one thinks on the common destinies of these two men and on the very different turn of their minds." Cardinal Mastai Ferretti became Pope Pius IX.; Archbishop Pecci went to his diocese of Perugia, where he remained thirty-two years—the whole long Pontificate of Pius IX.

The labors and solitudes of the episcopate occupied the attention of Archbishop Pecci in Perugia. Revolution and invasion—the former in 1849, when the Garibaldians took the city and were driven forth by the Austrians; the latter when the troops of the Sardinian King in 1859 invaded this portion of the States of the Church and held it in spite of right and justice. The Archbishop, who had been nominated Cardinal in 1853, protested, but was powerless to do more. It would be a long task to tell of the various churches restored, of the new ones built—no less than thirty-six churches were built, and the construction of ten more projected when he was called to Rome—of the charitable institutions established for castaways and orphans and superannuated priests, of the impulse given to studies by the founding of academies and the extension of the seminary. All these things which are included in the work of a Bishop who has the good of his people at heart were carried out to completion by Cardinal Pecci with his calm wisdom and in accordance with his conscientious sense of duty.

It has been said that every time a new Pope ascends the Chair of Peter Catholics experience some hesitation concerning the line he will follow. And this hesitation, together with an anxiety regarding the attitude he might take towards Italy, was felt on the accession of Cardinal Pecci as Leo XIII. A profound emotion pervaded the whole Church on the death of Pius IX. It might be said that the whole Catholic Hierarchy was composed of those whom he had chosen. His long life had rendered him so firmly associated with the Pontificate that when he passed away men said that the Papacy had come to an end.

The Conclave from which Leo XIII. came forth was one of the shortest on record. For some time previous to the death of Pius IX. it was observed that two Cardinals united in a remarkable degree the virtues and qualities which the circumstances seemed to require. These were Cardinal Riario Sforza, Archbishop of Naples, and Pecci, Archbishop of Perugia. Both of them were excellent administrators, moderate in politics, and both had shown great firmness re-

garding the principles and rights of the Holy See, while they knew how to keep themselves aloof from party. Cardinal Sforza preceded Pius IX. in the tomb; Pecci was left, and was the most noticeable figure in the Conclave. He had been appointed Camerlengo in 1877, shortly after the death of Cardinal Antonelli, Secretary of State, and in this office he directed the labors in the Vatican preparatory to the Conclave with that calm and serene judgment and method for which he had always been distinguished. The night previous to his election, as his conclavist, the late Mgr. Foschi, Archbishop of Perugia, related in the hearing of the writer, he slept on a mattress placed in one of the corridors of the Vatican. He did not know the rooms and halls in this Apostolic palace; on one occasion when he came to Rome he called at the Vatican eleven times before he was admitted to the presence of Pius IX., and this delay was attributed to Cardinal Antonelli, who was said to be jealous of the qualities of Cardinal Pecci and of the influence he might wield over Pius IX.

When the election was over, and the name of Leo XIII., who had received 44 out of 61 votes, was announced from the balcony above the central entrance to St. Peter's by the aged Cardinal Prospero Caterini, the new Pontiff, regarding the world from the solitary height of the Papacy, began to think how, in this most elevated and most serious of all earthly dignities, he should reconcile conscience and duty to the settlement of the difficulties before him. Cardinal Newman has declared that, by their office, the Popes are brought across every form of earthly power; "for they have a mission to high as well as low, and it is on the high, and not on the low, that their maintenance ordinarily depends. Cæsar ministers to Christ; the framework of society, itself a divine ordinance, receives such important aid from the sanction of religion that it is its interest in turn to uphold religion and to enrich it with temporal gifts and honors." Of Leo XIII., in this moment of entering upon his new task, it has been said that from the time when he succeeded Pope Pius he had formed a grand plan, "in which he took cognizance of all the needs of humanity and determined on the provisions he would make for those needs during the whole course of his Pontificate." His action moved in three special lines: the development of studies, and to such an extent that in the second year of his reign the name given by the Romans to his Pontificate was the Pontificate of the learned; an effective interest taken in the question of social science, and, finally, strenuous efforts employed to bring peace to Christian nations. The Holy See is considered by thinkers as standing at the head of Christian civilization; and as soon as Leo XIII. had assumed the white robe of the Pontiff he began to look out upon the world and see what were the most crying needs of Christendom. It became his task to close the dissen-

sions that separated the rulers of nations from the Church and to bind with stronger bonds of affection the peoples that held firm to the faith. On the very day of his election he sent forth letters to the sovereigns of Europe announcing his accession to the Pontifical throne.

The Emperor of Germany, William I., was at the head of the nation which from 1870 to 1878 had been the most active in its hostility to the Catholic Church, and therefore the Pontiff turned his attention to him on the very day of his election. After saluting "the most august and powerful Emperor and King" and announcing his elevation to the See of the Prince of the Apostles, the new Pontiff writes: "As to our great regret the happy relations which existed formerly between the Holy See and your Majesty have been broken off, we address your magnanimity in view of obtaining that peace and tranquillity of conscience *may be restored* to a great number of your subjects; and the Catholic subjects of your Majesty will not fail to show themselves, as the faith which they profess prescribes, devotedly respectful and faithful to your Majesty." The appeal of the Pontiff was not immediately listened to, but it prevailed in the long run; and the present Emperor of Germany paid, a few months ago, his third visit to the Vatican. The persecutions and imprisonment of Archbishops and Bishops, such as Ledochowski and Melchers and Eberhard and Martin, are forgiven, and the Catholics of Germany, though not having all the privileges they wish for, enjoy a considerable share of freedom. Circumstances favored the Pope. Prince Bismarck, when conciliation with the Pope was proposed to him, declared he would not go to Canossa; but a quarrel with Spain concerning proprietorship in the Caroline Islands drove him to seek a mediator in the person of Leo XIII., and thus the Iron Chancellor went to Rome instead of to Canossa. The gentle though persistent appeal of Leo XIII. to reason and good sense conquered here, and the happy relations now existing between Berlin and the Vatican record the success of the Pontiff's policy.

In France the action of the Pope in favor of the rights of Catholics has been strenuously resisted. Without passing any judgment on the origin or legitimacy of the government existing in that country, Leo XIII., seeing how hostile to religion were its acts and tendencies, called upon the French Catholics, many of whom still hoped in a restoration of the monarchy, to rally to the support of the actual government and by their influence direct it towards right and freedom and justice. For this the Pope has been accused of interfering in the concerns of France, but no one ignores to-day, as Pere Janvier notes, that the Holy Father has not spoken as a private person; he has in his quality of Head of the Church addressed the Catholics

of France, his subjects, in the religious point of view, with the intention of giving them a particular direction. His counsel appears not to have been adopted to its full extent, and Catholic voters paid little attention to the political attitude of their representatives, provided these latter promised to further local benefits or improvements. Anyhow, the action of the Pontiff failed to bring about the end he desired. The Government of France became more violent in its antagonism to Catholic religious institutions, and the fierce persecution of the religious congregations and orders of men and women throughout France to-day can scarcely find its parallel even in the fury of the Protestant Reformation in England. In a letter to Cardinal Richard, Archbishop of Paris, on the expulsion of the religious congregations from France, the Pontiff declared that it was evident such expulsion would cause irreparable damage to the country. In shutting off so rich a source of voluntary assistance it will increase the public misery in a notable degree, and the same blow will bring an end to an eloquent and constant preaching of concord and fraternity. The words of the Pontiff, however reasonable and convincing to honest minds, were disregarded by those who were at the head of the political affairs of the country. With a patience and gentleness that were indefatigable he strove to recall this "eldest daughter of the Church" to a sense of her duty, but his efforts were unavailing, and the sorrow for France continued with him to his death. History will judge of his policy towards France; there is little reason to expect that the future verdict will differ much from that of to-day.

With the Government of Italy the Pontiff continued the policy of his predecessor, Pius IX. This government did not fail to furnish him with cause sufficient to justify his attitude. At the very beginning of his Pontificate he was desirous, as soon as he was crowned, of coming to St. Peter's and, from the inner balcony over the vestibule of the church, and looking into it, giving his benediction to the people assembled in that vast building. The Italian Government refused to take steps for the maintenance of order on the occasion. The preparations that were being made in the church for this event were suspended and undone. From that time till the time of his death the conduct of the Italian Government was, more or less as occasion arose, hostile to the Pope. The removal of the remains of Pius IX. from the temporary resting place in St. Peter's to the tomb in San Lorenzo beyond the walls offered an occasion to the rabble and anti-clericals gathered in the Eternal City to make evident to the world the mode in which the Government of Italy protected the person of the Pope. On the way between the Vatican and San Lorenzo the roughs in Rome attempted, unhindered, to "throw the

carriage into the Tiber"—that is how they described the remains of Pius IX. Signor Mancini was Minister of the Interior at the time, and though all Rome knew that day—13th July, 1881—that the body of the late Pope was to be brought that night to its resting place, he took no care for the maintenance of order; and when the shameful scenes had created a feeling of abhorrence all the world over, the careless Mancini replied to Italian ambassadors abroad that this was a display of the popular feeling in Rome towards the Pope! Many thoughtful men accused him of condoning the gross outrage. Again, another blow was struck at the Pontiff by the erection of a statue to the apostate Dominican friar Giordano Bruno in the Campo de Fiori at Rome, where he was put to death in 1600. The writings of this apostate are described as of revolting immorality, and his comedy "*Il Candelajo*" surpasses in vileness all that has ever been written by the foulest authors even of the present-day pagan renaissance in Italy. The proposal to erect the statue, which was objected to by some Christian town councillors, brought about a manifestation of anti-Catholic fury; and the rabble, which is at one time radical and at another anti-Papal and monarchical, went through the streets shouting: "Death to the priests! Down with the Vatican! Viva Giordano Bruno!" The authorities allow these diversions to the people. Leo XIII. felt the insult to the Vatican given by these demonstrations, carried out under the patronage of the Minister Crispi.

And at intervals of greater or less duration occasion was made by the Italian authorities to justify the saying of the Pope that in Rome he was under hostile domination. Leo XIII. was not silent in regard to this antagonism of the Italian Government to the Papacy during the twenty-five years of his reign. In encyclical letters, in discourses and in letters of less solemnity he made known to the world abroad, as well as to Italy and Rome, that the rights of the Church still endured in spite of the years that have passed since their violation, and that as long as the Papacy is not respected and made independent the country will not prosper. The general tendency of Italian legislation, at least for the last quarter of a century, has been anti-Catholic. There is no sign of a change, and the only hope expressed by the liberal monarchical journals at the death of Leo XIII. seemed to be that he would be succeeded by a Pontiff who, yielding to the exigencies of the Italian Government, might become its willing ally or servant. The dissension that exists between the Vatican and the Quirinal during the last thirty-three years cannot be healed, and there is little reason to expect that a government under the leadership of such an opponent as Zanardelli will attempt the task.

The Church in the United States, which has made such immense progress under Leo XIII., received the special care of the Pontiff. On receiving the splendidly bound copy of the American Constitution, written on parchment, which President Cleveland sent to Leo XIII. on occasion of his sacerdotal jubilee in 1888, the latter said that in the United States "men enjoy liberty in the true sense of the word, . . . religion is free to extend every day more and more the empire of Christianity and the Church is free to develop its beneficent action." The growth of new dioceses, the establishment of the Catholic University of Washington, the appointment of a Delegate Apostolic and many other minor events testify to the affection of Leo XIII. to the United States. In his letter to Cardinal Gibbons announcing the appointment of a Delegate the Pontiff wrote: "We have solemnly declared not only that your nation is as dear to Us as other nations, the most flourishing, to which it is Our custom to send representatives of Our authority, but also that We desire to see these bonds of mutual union which attach you and your faithful to Our person consolidate themselves more and more from day to day." The actual condition of the Church in the United States and its devotion to the See of St. Peter show how completely the Pontiff's desire has been fulfilled.

In Ireland and in England his influence has been exerted. Though in the former country there were moments of trouble, the firm and invincible devotion of the Irish race to the Holy See remained unaffected. Leo XIII. may be said to have gone out of his way to make known to the Irish the high esteem and the love he had for them. With regard to England, his hopes had been raised so as to look forward for a great return of its people to the Church of their fathers; but that expectation was not fulfilled, and the process of conversion to the Catholic Church goes on as before, by that of individuals. Justin McCarthy, in his "Leo XIII.," attributes to him: "A passion of philanthropy. There have been political Popes and theological Popes, but Leo the Thirteenth is above all a philanthropic Pope." And he notes that "some of the great social movements which came up during his time might well have intimidated a less heroic spirit. Some men in any position at all resembling that of Leo might have turned away in mere affright from certain of the developments of Socialism which we have all seen during these latter years. The Pope had no fear. He looked boldly and searchingly into each new phenomenon and calmly endeavored to understand its actual significance. He seems to have brought to bear no prejudices, no unalterable preconceived opinions to the task of examination." The consequence was that his encyclicals on social questions appealed directly to the reason and the heart of thinking men. The

clear-sighted and calm persuasiveness of the Pope's reasoning captured the attention of all. The singleness of purpose, the longing after justice and charity for the poor workingman which inspired his words went straight to the hearts of men. It would be rash to say that his encyclicals have changed the world or ameliorated in all parts the conditions of labor, but the consciousness has spread abroad that there is an influence at work in the world making for right and justice and for the gradual checking of "man's inhumanity to man."

Almost the whole field of human duty towards God and man has been traversed by Leo XIII. in his encyclicals. During his thirty-two years in Perugia he produced a number of pastoral letters addressed to his flock which are regarded as masterpieces in their way. The same clear expression of profound thought, the same inspiring enthusiasm for all that is saintly and noble and elevating which distinguish his encyclicals may be perceived here in germ. The man was accustomed to think clearly, to weigh dispassionately conflicting opinions, to judge impartially and to express in language that was as limpid as it was exact the pronouncements that were so important to his flock. When he reached the Papacy his flock became world-wide, and his pronouncements went to the very ends of the earth, and all men recognized their sincerity and their usefulness. In a letter to the Episcopate of Turin, Vercelli and Genoa in 1879 he defends Christian marriage, and in the following year he issued an encyclical treating the matter more extensively and protesting against divorce. The origin of political sovereignty and the advantages which the Church renders to princes and peoples were shown forth in an encyclical published in 1881. The admirable encyclical "*Auspicato concessum*," published in 1882, treated of St. Francis of Assisi and the propagation of the Order of Franciscan tertiaries. This was followed soon by the issuing of a Pontifical Constitution reforming the rule of the secular Third Order of St. Francis. The letters and encyclicals of Leo XIII. have been collected and fill several volumes. They constitute a marvelous testimony to the extent of his work and to his mental activity.

In the domain of science and literature and art the intelligent impulse of Leo XIII. has been felt. St. Thomas Aquinas, as the great model of Christian philosophy whose mind and principles are to be followed, was proposed to students in his encyclical of 4th August, 1879. The foundation in Rome of the *Accademia* of St. Thomas Aquinas followed closely on this. The science of history reaped the greatest advantage from his action regarding the Vatican Library and Archives. In a letter to Cardinals De Luca Pitra and Hergenröther in 1883 he announced the intention of opening these treasures

of history to the students of all nations, and he insisted upon the benefits the Sovereign Pontiffs have bestowed on Italy. "To the honor of the Holy See comes the greatest part of the renown which Italy has acquired in sciences and fine arts. Greek and Latin literature would have perished, or almost so, if the Popes and the clergy had not saved from shipwreck the débris of ancient works. At Rome what was done and accomplished speaks still louder: the ancient monuments preserved at great expense, new masterpieces of art created and perfected by the genius of the princes of art, museums and libraries founded, schools opened for the education of youth and the inauguration of great lyceums: all these things have brought Rome to this point of honor that, with a unanimous voice, she is declared the mother of the fine arts." The science of astronomy owes to his initiative the establishment of a new observatory at the Vatican, supported from the scant means which Leo XIII. was able to afford.

In the department of learning Leo XIII. promoted the publication of most important documents at his own expense, such as the "Regesta Pontificum." The same love of letters led him to found new halls and museums and schools. In 1880 he purchased a collection of autographs of Cardinals and Bishops who were at the Council of Trent and donated them to the Vatican archives, with a group of various manuscripts of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries containing the *corpus juris* of Justinian and the Gregorian codex. In 1882 he purchased a whole library of medical chirurgical works and placed them in the Vatican Library for the use of students. In 1891 he had the very celebrated Vatican Greek Bible reproduced in phototype, which was almost as clear as the original manuscript for the use of great libraries. In 1885 he erected a printing establishment in the Vatican for the exclusive use of the Holy See and the Sacred Congregations. All arts and sciences found an asylum in the Vatican. Painting made grand additions to the notable works in that palace under the protection of Leo XIII. The Gallery of the Candelabra, specially adorned and decorated by order of Leo XIII., presents a magnificent appearance. Here the Roman painter Ludovico Seitz has introduced his new symbolism in color and design with the happiest effect, expressing to future generations the works distinctive of the Pontificate of Leo up till 1899, when the decoration was finished. The bronze statue of St. Peter on the column commemorative of the Vatican Council in the Garden of the Pine in the Vatican, the great statue of S. Thomas Aquina in the Vatican Library and the sepulchral monument of Innocent III. in the Lateran basilica are notable indications of his encouragement to sculpture. The enlargement of the apse of this

same basilica projected by Pius IX. and, after serious counsel with the leading architects of Europe, carried out in its present splendor, is an evidence of his love for noble architecture. The construction of the Church of St. Joachim and the renewal of many buildings at his expense in Rome and in his native Carpineto are further proofs of his love for this noble art. When a gunpowder explosion took place in the military quarters beyond St. Paul's, outside Rome, and the Vatican was much shaken, it was found that the frescoes on the walls of the "Appartamento Borgia," painted by Pinturicchio, were in danger of perishing. With that love for the fine arts which he could not escape having after so long a residence in the heart of Umbria, Leo XIII. undertook the restoration of these admirable works. There are few works of the present day for which artists have more reason to be grateful than for the very careful and able restoration of Pinturicchio's paintings and of the whole of the halls executed under the intelligent direction of Leo XIII. A splendid work of elephantine bulk, containing a complete collection of heliotypes and of chromo-lithographs illustrative of the art of this "Appartamento Borgia," was published under the patronage of the Pontiff in an edition of one hundred copies, which he sent to rulers of States and distinguished scholars throughout Europe and America. The text was supplied by the late Enrico Stevenson and the Rev. Father Ehrle, S. J. The object of this great book was to make known the art of the Umbrian master Pinturicchio. Thus Leo XIII. proved himself a most illustrious patron of the arts, as far as the condition in which he was placed made it possible.

In the department of Christian archæology, which has such close connection with the history of the Church in the early centuries of Rome, Leo XIII. has seen a considerable growth. The choicest objects found in the Catacombs or in ancient churches are preserved in a special department near the Vatican Library. De Rossi published a descriptive catalogue of the treasures accumulated in that sacred museum from the beginning of Leo XIII.'s Pontificate until 1893. The scientific historian of the early Church must take into account the testimony furnished by such findings as these to the arts and customs of early Christians. The most important in many respects of the contributions to Christian archæology is the inscription of Abercius, sent in gift by the Sultan of Turkey to His Holiness Leo XIII., which, together with another fragment of the same inscription presented to the Pope by the discoverer, Professor W. M. Ramsay, M. A., of Aberdeen, forms now the ornament of the Lateran Christian Museum. This illustrious monument may be considered the gem of the museum. These objects, which have escaped destruction in the course of the centuries, cast an unexpected light

on the Christian life and belief of the past, and come therefore within the circle of the Pope's consideration and solicitude.

Thus in all his work throughout the long course of his life Leo XIII., both in preparation for the great office he finally reached and during his twenty-five years in that office, appears as a pious, serious, thoughtful man, conscious of the weight and responsibility of his words and deeds. The thoroughness which distinguished him as a youth accompanies him through life, even to the very last days. His heart and mind are absorbed in every work. From his early years he devotes his labors to God and the good of his neighbor. In the Pontificate the same dedication and the same labor for the good of mankind marks his efforts. Careful, thoughtful, devoid of that momentary enthusiasm which people sought in a Pope, cautious in the use of words, gentle in persuasion and long suffering, he was unique amongst the great men of his day. He believed in human beings and waited until their fury or madness would pass away in order that he might make appeal to their better reason. In this he was mostly successful: with France alone his failing health brought him to death before his patience had conquered the aberrations of its rulers.

A recent publication has it that "Leo XIII. played with the surface of things, and the results he obtained were superficial." It would be rash to predict what may happen in the future, but the voice of the world at his death and the genuine feeling expressed concerning the quality and extent of his work do not seem to justify the statement. For the moment the coming of the new Pope has occupied the thoughts of men, but when the preoccupation of the present time passes and the minds of men begin to measure the character and life work of Leo XIII., it is not improbable that he will be ranged among the great ones of the glorious line of Pontiffs that have ruled the Church of Christ.

P. L. CONNELLAN.

Rome, Italy.

IRELAND IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY.

IT WAS after an interval of twenty years that the writer of these remarks revisited Ireland this past summer. It was nearly as many before since he first quitted his native land to begin the struggle of life in a distant one. Return, under such circumstances, calls up naturally the question how much has the country and its people changed during the last generation. There is a singular awaking of boyhood recollections when one returns to his native country after a prolonged absence. The scenery, the general ways of life, even the buildings and streets in the towns are almost unchanged, but the actors in the life around are all new, though somehow bearing a closer resemblance to the friends of early life now long passed away than the populations with whom one has since grown familiar by daily intercourse and later connections. The question inevitably forces itself on the returning Irishman whether the new generation has advanced, morally, intellectually and materially, beyond the generation of Irishmen which was young with himself more than twenty golden years ago. Further, he is drawn to compare the Ireland he finds himself in to-day with other lands at present whose condition is even more familiar to him than the recollections of young manhood in his native land.

On the last point, the comparison between the conditions of life in Ireland and in America or England it is hard to give an opinion in few words, though many visitors have no difficulty in attempting the task. In material wealth, in public works and buildings and the hum of commercial activity modern Ireland is far indeed behind New York or Pennsylvania or California. The older parts of Dublin and Cork or Limerick have scarcely changed their appearance in forty years; indeed, their principal buildings date back yet beyond the century just ended. An examination of the numerous public edifices of Dublin, its courts of law, its custom house, its national bank, its cathedrals reveals the strange fact that more than nine-tenths of those in the first class date from the eighteenth century, before the Union. The General Post Office, the National Gallery and library buildings and those of the new Royal University are almost the only public buildings erected in Dublin during the last fifty years. The churches, convents and hospitals are not included in this class, which refers only to the municipal or State erections. It is a strange comment on the effects of the Union on Irish governmental activity during the past century.

There has certainly been a large amount of private building done in Dublin and Belfast and to a lesser extent in Cork during the last

fifty years, but it is chiefly in the way of additions to the older business towns, which themselves have been but little changed. The whole amount, if judged by the expenditure of labor and material, is singularly small when compared with any American city of the population of Dublin alone.

In manufactures and business activity the contrast is even more noticeable between America and Ireland. There is a fair amount of business activity in the streets of the larger cities, but few great establishments and fewer manufactures. One is struck by the number of foreign agencies in the business streets, and also by the numerous deserted factories and mills, through the south especially, which point to former industries gone out of existence. There is little evidence of new ones arising to take their place, and, generally speaking, the commercial prosperity of Ireland, compared with that of most American communities, is small indeed.

However, man does not live by bread alone, and there are deeper interests in human life than commerce or the production of wealth. One is struck at landing in Cork or Dublin from America by the cheerful and contented look on most faces. The working men may be poorer than their brethren in America or England, but if their faces can be trusted they seem decidedly happier. One notes almost none of the hard, dogged look so common in the streets of New York or Chicago or that fierce discontent which is seen everywhere in other countries on the features of a large part of the city population. If a dinner of herbs with content be better than a stalled ox and contention therewith, then assuredly the life of the Irish people is better than that of most others. A fine Sunday in Dublin is a revelation of orderly enjoyment on the part of all classes that can hardly be paralleled elsewhere. Quarreling and rowdyism seem unknown, though the interest in outdoor sports is of the keenest. The general kindly civility of the population is remarkable, and especially the absence of the profanity and indecency in speech which one hears so constantly in American cities.

The readiness of the whole population to take interest in sports and festivals is remarkable. I arrived at a country town of a couple of thousand inhabitants on the day of the motor international race. Almost the whole male population had gone thirteen miles away to see it, including the entire police force. The stores and even the banks were closed as if on Sunday, and even the extra porter who hauled luggage usually from the railroad depot had absented himself to see the race. It should be added that there was no betting on the result and little drinking among the lookers on. They found ample enjoyment in watching the start and whirl of the automobiles, and most of the young men in the town rose at three in the morning

and cheerfully walked thirteen miles for the sake of watching them.

It is impossible to avoid the conclusion that all classes in Ireland get more happiness out of life than the more highly paid population of America does. The two shillings a day of the Irish laborer furnishes more content and less worry than the two dollars of the New England factory operative or the forty cents an hour of the New York longshoreman. A like spirit runs through all classes. If millionaires are few and far between, so are the aspirations for millions to spend, and really the human happiness of most Irishmen who have an income of four or five hundred pounds seems decidedly larger than that of most wealthy Americans. The painful feature of modern Irish life to a stranger is that even the very moderate requirements of its people seem to be impossible of attainment. Most of them are desirous to remain at home if they could find employment at even the existing rates, but though the population has fallen nearly a half in fifty-five years, the problem how to find work at home seems as hard of solution as ever. Forty thousand emigrants left Ireland last year, while the growth of the population naturally was only twenty-four thousand. There were only twenty-three thousand marriages in all the country in that time, or five in the thousand, less than two-thirds of the rate in England, Germany or Spain. That fact indicates a special difficulty in obtaining a livelihood in Ireland, while it settles one of the pretended explanations of Irish distress lately current in English periodicals, namely, that it was due to reckless early marriages. As a matter of fact, less than two per cent. of the marriages in Ireland last year were contracted by minors under twenty-one.

The causes of this small number of marriages in Ireland are easily understood. About half the population, over four hundred thousand families, are farmers, who cultivate land that in a sense is their own, subject to heavy rent and taxation. Most of the farms give nothing more than bare support to the occupiers and their families. There is no chance to find holdings for grown-up sons or daughters who desire to marry and live as farmers like their parents. The work of extra hands under existing conditions gives no result in money to the family, and the sons of the farm holders have no opening to earn outside. Few care to work for others, as it involves a kind of social degradation which is keenly dreaded. The wages of the ordinary farm laborers besides scarcely average ten shillings a week and offer no inducement to compensate for this loss of social respect. The grown-up children of farmers have, therefore, no choice but to emigrate or pass their lives in idleness or unpaid work at home.

The farm laborers who own no land are probably about half the

number of the farm owners. The wages paid them have risen somewhat in late years, but still are extremely low. There has been a marked change both in the housing and dietary of this class during the last forty years. The houses erected by the local authorities and rented at cost are a great improvement on the mud cabins which sheltered the last generation, but there are not enough by any means for all the laborers. The change in food has been largely to tea and American bacon of poor quality from the old routine of potatoes, oatmeal and milk. It is more than doubtful whether it is really an improvement in point of health and strength-giving qualities. The wages of laborers are so small as to offer no chance of rising from the condition of day laborer, and so the toilers continue to swell the tide of emigrants.

It should be borne in mind that the migration of the farming population to city life is not peculiar to Ireland. It is noticed as well in England, Germany and America, but it does not carry the migrants out of their own country as it does in Ireland. The absence of manufacturing or commercial industries in the country itself deprives the Irish farmer or farm hand of any chance of other employment except at the price of expatriation. The factories that exist are already supplied with operatives, and few new ones have been begun. The shipbuilding and linen trade of Ulster, the tweeds and serges of Munster and the other Irish manufactures are too small to supply work for surplus farm labor from the country. At most they can barely provide work for those already engaged in them. Irish manufactures, like the Irish population, have been steadily dwindling during the last sixty years, and in fact their decay began somewhat earlier. Everywhere through the land one notes deserted mills and factories. The shipyards of Dublin and Portlaw, which once gave employment to thousands, are now deserted. In every Irish city one finds the larger part of the business controlled by foreign agencies. Even in the limited manufacturing industries which still exist many of the most important put a ban on the employment of Irishmen, if Catholics, in any important position. In the great Dublin brewery of Guinness & Co., the largest in the United Kingdom, scarcely a Catholic can be found in any position above that of a laborer. Admission even to the ranks of the latter class is mainly by "influence" on the part of friends of the management. It is as hard to obtain work as a brewery porter in Dublin as to get a position on the New York or San Francisco police force. The same statement may be made of most of the Irish railroads, the directors of which look with undisguised dislike on the "Common Irish Catholic." In the Great Southern and Western Railroad, the largest in Ireland, and one which derives its revenue

from a population of which nine-tenths are Catholics, ninety-five per cent. of the positions drawing salaries of over five hundred dollars annually are filled by Protestants appointed by "influence" of their co-religionists in the directorate. In the shipyards of Harland & Wolfe, in Belfast, scarcely a dozen of Catholics can be found among the several thousand ship mechanics employed. Remembering that one-third of the population of Belfast itself are Catholics, one may appreciate the intolerance of the "ascendancy" class which even now largely dominates the administration of the law, the management of the land, the commerce, the manufactures and the higher education of the Irish people.

The prospects for young Irish Catholics of a higher social position are scarcely brighter in their way than those of the agricultural population. They are barred from a large part of the great business establishments by the same bigotry which refuses a Catholic shipwright the chance to drive a rivet or turn a lathe in Messrs. Harland's yards. The professions offer a surprisingly small field in Ireland compared with America or England. A recent return showed the total number of medical practitioners at little over thirty-two hundred in a population as large as that of Pennsylvania. It is safe to say an American community would give profitable employment to eight times the number. Nevertheless the average incomes of Irish doctors are very small. About a thousand are employed as dispensary and workhouse doctors, the appointments to these positions being made by the local County Councils. The competition for most of them is very keen, and it needs much local influence as well as a regular diploma to attain one. Yet the salaries are usually only six hundred dollars a year. For this not only attendance at the institution on stated days, but also visits to all the indigent sick who obtain tickets from the relieving officer are required. The scale of remuneration provided for such duties is a good comment on the general poverty of the community and may explain the exodus of educated as well as uneducated Irishmen from Ireland to-day.

The legal profession, if exercised without government appointments of some kind, is even less promising than the medical. The courts are almost empty of business, and it is suggestive to visit the Four Courts any day and note the petty character of the disputes which occupy the twelve Superior Judges whose salaries average twenty thousand dollars each. It looks as though the whole amount of the civil claims adjudicated in each year were less than the amounts paid to the judges alone. The number of legal appointments of all kinds—Chancellor, Judges, Masters of the Rolls, County Judges, Resident Magistrates, Registrars, Commissioners and

others—is enormous compared with the actual legal requirements of the people. Those offices, however, are all in the gift of the English administration and are only to be got by renouncing all show of national patriotism. To win a profitable income at the bar by simple talent seems almost impossible in Ireland to-day. It is certainly much rarer than it was fifty or a hundred years ago, and the professional character of the Irish Bar has fallen accordingly. Still the cost of admission either to the legal or medical profession in Ireland is higher both in time and money than anywhere in the United States. Whether this be an evil or a good it is not necessary to discuss here. It is only mentioned as an illustration of the difficulties in the way of finding employment which confront Irishmen of the present day in Ireland more than in other lands.

Outside the professions there seems hardly any opening in Ireland to-day for young men of higher education. Engineering works are mainly under government control or that of corporations like the railroads whose intolerance bars Catholics from employment. It must be recollected that as Ireland is a Catholic country, more than three-quarters of its population are practically under ban of the powers that be in public work of all kinds. The powers recently acquired by the elected County Councils have opened the appointments to local offices such as the County Surveyors to Catholics, but until recently the Grand Juries controlled them in a spirit of all but absolute intolerance. It will need some years to train even the limited number who can hope to obtain a share in these offices. Architecture offers some, but only a limited field, for educated work, but in it, too, the public works are not, in any appreciable degree, to be looked for by Irishmen. For art or literature as profitable professions there has been literally no encouragement in Ireland during the last forty years. Such as elect to pursue them as a means of living are forced to emigrate of necessity. The press alone furnishes some employment, but it is not of a character to attract bright intellects in any number. A journal of the standing of the old Dublin *Nation* would be impossible in Ireland at the present moment.

The teaching profession is even less attractive in its rewards than those already mentioned. Trinity College, with its estates drawn from the public property of a value of nearly two hundred thousand dollars a year, is in the hands of the Episcopalian body, which numbers at most an eighth part of the Irish population. The three Queen's Colleges are government institutions, appointments in which, as in the legal profession, are determined by official favor rather than intellectual merit. Belfast College, the largest of the three, has been practically handed over to the control of the Presby-

terian General Assembly. For forty years after its foundation no Catholic was allowed to hold a chair in it, with one exception. That was the chair of Irish language, which was maintained on the munificent salary of one hundred pounds a year as a generous concession of the English administration. The three and a half millions of Irish Catholics have no institution that can be called a university. A limited number of fellowships in the State Board of Examiners known as the Royal University are the only positions open to them except the very small chance of professorships in the Queen's Colleges or Trinity. These are almost the only openings for Irishmen who desire to devote their energies to scientific or literary studies such as occupy thousands in the universities of England or the continental countries of Europe. The body of national teachers cannot aspire to an income of over three hundred dollars a year, and most of them receive very much less. The higher paid members of the educational body as inspectors, normal school professors and commissioners are all appointed by the government Board of Education. Their first appointments are to a degree competitive, but their subsequent promotion is largely dependent on political obsequiousness. It is hardly needed to say that anything like original thought on educational matters would be fatal to the personal prospects of an inspector or normal school principal.

The whole matter of public education is indeed one of the most important points to be settled in Ireland at present. The schools have been the field in which the last struggle of British statesmen to change the religion of the Irish people to modified British models has been fought. During the penal laws all literary instruction was absolutely forbidden to Irish Catholics. After the Union a system of State aided schools, known as the Kildare Place Society, was devised and received a few thousand pounds annually from the Treasury. There was no system of examination of the teachers, and Catholic as well as Protestant teachers could receive grants for teaching, but the reading of the Scriptures was obligatory in every school, "without note or comment." The Irish Catholics after a short time decided not to sanction this practice. In consequence Lord Stanley prepared a new scheme in 1836, which has been, with modifications, the law of primary schooling in Ireland since that time. It provided aid from the public funds for all schools having a certain number of pupils which could come up to the standard of examinations required by a newly formed Board of National Education. The Board consisted of seven members appointed by the administration, one of them receiving a salary and being practical manager of the policy of the Board. As four-fifths of the population were Catholics, Lord Stanley proposed that only secular instruc-

tion should be dealt with by the Board, but that religious teaching should be given separately to each denomination by its own clergy. The grant for public education was only sufficient to pay very small salaries to the teachers, and at first the providing school houses was left to local private efforts. Each school was to have a local manager, who when recognized as such had the appointing or dismissal of the teachers and the general control of the school building. The Government Board claimed the regulation of the studies, the books used and general compliance with their rules. On these conditions they allotted salaries to the teachers, according to their classification, which was determined by the Board's inspectors. The supply of books at low rates and grants in aid of school buildings were other features of the system of Lord Stanley.

At a later period the Board advanced funds for building new schools which were to be more under its own control. It added a system of district model schools in which the teachers were appointed by its own officials and also normal schools for training teachers under professors and superintendents of its own appointment. Either might have been helpful in improving Irish schooling if honestly carried out, but in practice the policy of the Board for many years was directed to introducing English and Protestant ideas among the Irish Catholic peasantry much more than to developing their intellects. Dr. Whately, the English Protestant Archbishop of Dublin, was one of the early commissioners, and he dominated the Board in virtue of his position for nearly twenty years. He used his influence to introduce various semi-religious tracts of his own among the Irish children, and the secular textbooks were also prepared under his guidance. All reference to Irish ideas and even to Ireland was carefully excluded from the school books thus prepared. A curious illustration of English ideas of impartial treatment for Irish Catholics was given by the constitution of the original Board. It consisted of seven members, two of whom were Catholics, to protect the interests of seven millions of Catholics, and five Protestants, to ensure justice for the million and a half of Irish Protestants.

The first Resident Commissioner selected to form a satisfactory educational system for the Irish Catholic people was the Rev. Mr. Carlisle, a Presbyterian clergyman, whose qualifications rested on the fact that he had conducted a strictly Presbyterian academy for some years in Dublin. The ushers employed in this academy were named as first directors of the normal school provided by the State to form teachers for the Irish Catholic people. They also were deputed to form the school books on which their educational training was to be moulded. The spirit in which their task was carried out may

be guessed at from the fact that scarcely a reference to Irish history or character is to be found in the so-called "National" school books. Even the well-known song of Lover, "The Angels Whisper," which appeared in an early edition of one of the readers, was eliminated as savoring too much of "Popish superstition," though written by a Protestant poet.

Though the efforts of the Catholic hierarchy and the attachment of the people to their faith have baffled the hopes of Archbishop Whately of "sapping the vast edifice of the Church through the national school system," the effects of the constant supervision of anti-national authorities over the public schools has had a very marked effect in dwarfing the intellectual development of the Irish people during the last fifty years. A knowledge of reading and writing has been widely diffused indeed. During the last year nine-tenths of the persons married in Ireland were familiar with writing, as against half the number fifty years ago; but the results of the school system seem to have gone no further. Technical education, which has been so useful on the European continent in training the people to the ways of making a livelihood, is almost unknown in the Irish national school system. The number of pupils who go through the higher grades is extremely small, and there are scarcely any facilities in most parts of the country for using the faculties of reading and writing acquired at school. Irish education emphatically needs reform in all its branches, from the national primary school to the universities. Such reform, to be effective, can only be carried out by the Irish people itself on its own ideals. The control of Irish education by the Irish people is at least as important for their welfare as emancipation from the English land system.

The changes in administration made during recent years by the formation of elected County Councils to replace the former Grand Juries of landlords has undoubtedly had a good effect in training the people to practical business methods in the management of their own affairs. The action of the Councils, however, is still largely controlled by irresponsible bodies named at discretion by the English Ministry, and the members of which are, for the most part, distinctly hostile to Irish nationality. It is to be hoped that from the exercise even of such limited governmental powers the people may soon rise to control of their own schools. The whole system of boards appointed by the English administration to control Irish local administration, education, public works, police and commerce must be swept away before any real progress can be looked for in Ireland. The settlement of the question between landlords and tenants which has been attempted this year is of much less real importance than

the removal of the strings on national development caused by these hostile Government Boards. Full control of the national education by the Irish people itself is, we believe, of far more vital importance than the land bill.

The truth of this assertion can hardly be denied in view of the causes which are steadily driving the Irish agricultural population out of Ireland under existing conditions. The reduction in actual burthens of rent promised by the land bill just signed will be at most twenty-five per cent. on the existing rents. Such an amount is altogether insufficient to keep the young farmers and farm laborers at home. It can only be done by the diffusion of practical education, by the cultivation of business training, the development of Irish manufactures and the regulation of Irish commerce and railroads to the end of enabling the Irish people to live and increase in their own land. Education wisely devised alone can solve these questions. They cannot be solved by any acts of Parliament, but they may be solved by the intelligence of the Irish people when freed from the fetters which have so long cramped it.

There appears no real reason why the Irish people, if not misgoverned, should not increase and prosper at home. The soil is as fertile as that of most lands, the facilities for commerce greater than of almost any of the same size. The race showed its capacity for manufactures amply during even the limited part of the eighteenth century when self rule was accompanied with a partial relaxation of the old intolerance which made slaves of three-fourths of the population as Catholics. The causes of the depopulation of the last sixty years cannot be found either in the capacity of the country to support a much larger population or that of its people to develop its resources if left to their freedom. The density of population in Ireland to-day is less than that of most European lands. Belgium supports without difficulty seven millions of people on a territory less than one-third of Ireland, yet the latter finds it hard to give work to less than five millions. Ireland is the one country in the civilized world whose population is dwindling, and it has been diminishing without respite for nearly sixty years. The first census taken after the accession of the late Queen Victoria gave Ireland over eight millions of people, while England had but fifteen and Scotland less than three millions. To-day Scotland exceeds Ireland in population and England and Wales reckon nearly seven times as many inhabitants. Roughly reckoning, when Victoria ascended the throne the Irish formed one-third of the population of the British Islands. To-day those in Ireland are scarcely one-eighth of the total. The growth on one side of the Irish Sea and the decrease on the other have been going on for well nigh sixty years, and they still

continue. Until that condition ceases it is idle to speak of any prosperity for Ireland or the Irish people within its borders.

What makes the depopulation of Ireland more remarkable is that every other European land has steadily gained during the last sixty years. Switzerland, Belgium, Germany, Italy, Spain, Russia and even Turkey are all more populous now than fifty years ago. Even the so-called Kingdom of Poland, which shares with Ireland the disadvantages of foreign rule, has doubled its population and more than quadrupled its wealth since 1841. Ireland then numbered eight millions and Poland little over four. At the present day the Kingdom of Poland has eight millions and Ireland less than five. The Polish provinces under Prussian rule have nearly doubled their population in the same period, despite of hostile legislation on the part of their German rulers and very considerable emigration. Even the Christian provinces under the Sultan's rule in Europe have grown in inhabitants, while Ireland is being depopulated during a continuous period of more than fifty years.

The decay has never ceased since it began in the time of the potato failure in 1846. The last census had shown eight million two hundred thousand inhabitants of Ireland, and at the same rate of increase as in the former decade they must have grown to much over eight and a half millions by the close of 1845. The disease which suddenly attacked a single vegetable product wiped a quarter of the population of Ireland from their country in five years. The census of 1851 showed six and a half millions as the total remaining in Ireland at that time. The *Times*, the organ par excellence of English public opinion, at the time summed up the destruction with the comment: "The Celts are gone—gone with a vengeance." The language is worth remembering. It gives a key to understanding the spirit of humanitarian feeling which prevailed and still prevails in the governing class in Great Britain.

The famine caused by the potato disease continued three years, but its cessation with 1848 brought no stop to the decrease in the population of Ireland. It had fallen to six and a half millions in 1851; it was only five and three-quarter millions in 1861, five and a half in 1871, five millions one hundred and fifty thousand in 1881, under five millions at the close of the next decade and little over four and a half millions at the close of the century. The decrease still continues, and one of the characteristic scenes of Irish life witnessed by King Edward on his last visit to Cork was the departure of a tug from Queenstown laden with Irish emigrants for the United States. The King is said to have been much struck by the sight. At his departure from Ireland he generously bestowed a thousand pounds for relief of the poor of the Irish capital as a token of his

practical sympathy with his Irish subjects and their wants. Two weeks later Mr. Andrew Carnegie presented twenty-eight thousand as a gift to the city of Dublin for a public library. The munificence of British royalty was, we are assured, keenly appreciated in Ireland. The decrease of its population, however, still continues.

Besides this munificent personal gift, King Edward at the close of his visit issued a friendly address to his Irish subjects. In it he urged the value of self-reliance among the class in question as the best means of remedying the lack of general prosperity which had been presented to his eyes in Ireland as compared with Great Britain. There is always something comic in the lectures of high placed personages on the remedies for poverty. The French Princess who wondered why the country people should die in a famine rather than live on bread and cheese is a fair parallel to the well meant exhortation of the British monarch to his Irish subjects. The cultivation of self-reliance as an intellectual character will hardly enable a captive to work with both hands tied behind him. The difficulties which beset the finding of fit employment for all classes of the Irish people are mainly material obstacles imposed by the effects of foreign legislation and unfriendly administration. The first object which Irish self-reliance aims at is the power to control its own action, and that is precisely what English government denies it by main force. When four-fifths of the Irish people seek to form their system of public education on the lines they deem best suited for national development they are confronted by a hostile majority in Parliament which denies them university training on any system but that which it thinks suitable. The primary schools are dominated by a handful of ministerial dependents, who forbid any attempt to change the methods of instruction which they think best fitted to prevent the growth of any free national spirit. Do the County Councils elected by the people desire to inaugurate public works from the people's money or to house the poor in a suitable manner the Local Government Board forbids any expenditure for such ends without its sovereign permission, which is often refused without explanation. Are public funds to be expended for national purposes concerning the whole island, for drainage works, canals, piers or harbors, an irresponsible Board of Works, whose incapacity is even greater than its arrogance, takes charge of the whole matter and builds harbors on the sands above low water mark, like one lately near Dublin. The whole general revenue raised from Ireland is controlled by the British administration, not by the Irish people. Its amount has been steadily raised year after year since the famine, almost inversely with the decrease of the population. In 1853 the imperial taxation of Ireland was four million pounds, when the pop-

ulation numbered six and a half millions. To-day it is nearly ten million pounds, while the people have dwindled to four and a half millions. At the beginning of the Crimean War the imperial taxation was about fourteen shillings on each individual, and even then the country was steadily perishing under burthens beyond its resources. To-day the taxation has risen to nearly two pounds five shillings, or three times what it was fifty years ago. And the demand for relief of the Irish people is only met with an increased constabulary force and a coercion act which leaves their personal liberty absolutely at the mercy of the British Viceroy. To recommend self-reliance as the cure for such a condition of practical politics recalls the worthy in Huckleberry Finn's experience who "charged nothing for the preaching he gave the neighbors, and it was worth it, too."

The lack of capital in Ireland as compared with other English-speaking countries is undoubtedly a leading cause of the lack of employment, which renders it impossible for so many Irishmen to find a livelihood at home. The excessive taxation imposed by England is without question the chief cause of that poverty in Ireland generally. About three-fourths of the ten odd million pounds raised for imperial taxation is yearly carried out of the island without any return. There is promise of a bonus of twelve million pounds in the land bill this year for the purpose of inducing the landlord class to end the system of land tenure introduced into Ireland by English law. Even the more sober part of the English public speak of this as a measure of national generosity of England to Ireland, like the vote for the purchase of the slaves of the West Indies sixty-five years ago. As a simple matter of fact, the English treasury has drawn ten fold that amount from Ireland during the last twenty years, during which the land legislation has been the subject of practical reforms. The financial relief which the bill promises to the Irish farming class is at most about a reduction of seven million dollars annually in their rents. About five times that amount continues to be yearly drawn from the impoverished country for the expenditures of the English Government in every other part of the world. Can any real return of prosperity to Ireland be looked for from the new legislation under such conditions?

It is not a pleasant task to point out the true condition of affairs in Ireland to-day, to note how decay continues in its population, its wealth and even in its intellectual development, but it is absolutely necessary to know the evil before one can pretend to find its remedy. It is a common charge against the Irish people that they waste their energies on political discussion when they would be better employed in developing the material resources of their coun-

try. To an observer on the spot it is evident that political effort is absolutely necessary before any material development can be attained. The crushing weight of taxation can only be removed by political action. The formation of a suitable educational system can only be removed by political action. The facilities for extending manufactures and commerce and protecting nascent industries must be worked for by political action. Parliamentary debates, election machinery, public speeches and gatherings are not very inspiring work, but they are still an absolute necessity for the Irish people if it is to continue to exist in its present home.

In what may be called the social and moral aspect the condition of Ireland is much more satisfactory than in the material one. Though poor the country is free from crime to an extent unknown elsewhere in the civilized world. The total number of penitentiary or State prison convicts is only about five hundred in the four and a half millions. There is but one such to every nine thousand individuals. The proportion in the United States last year was more than ten times that amount. During the last two months only two homicides have occurred throughout Ireland. One was the act of a lunatic, the other of an English soldier who came over expressly to commit it. In about half the counties absolutely no crime has been brought before the courts. It seems that during the preceding three months there was no case of murder or homicide in the whole country.

The proportion of illegitimate to legitimate births, as told by the Registrar General, for the last year is equally noteworthy. The percentage is two and a half per cent., or about one-third that of England. Drunkenness is not common either in city or country, and agrarian quarrels have almost ceased. The constabulary returns for the three months ending the day of my arrival gave the following curious figures for the whole country's record. It should be added that they deal not with crimes proved in court, but merely incidents reported by the police as possibly such. The list of possible offenses is a long one. It enumerates murder, homicide, firing at the person, inciting to kill, poisoning, conspiracy to murder, cutting or maiming, cattle stealing, highway robbery, burglary, sacrilege, perjury, conspiracy and attempted extortion. No case of any of these was reported among the whole population of Ireland during three months. The total docket of agrarian crime for that time in a population nearly that of Pennsylvania consisted of twenty-nine threatening anonymous letters, six charges of malicious mischief, six alleged incendiary fires of the same class, six ordinary battery charges. One case was reported of each of the following: Assault on police, firing at a dwelling, assault with deadly weapon and taking

forcible possession of premises. It may be well asked what population elsewhere can show such a record?

The comparison between the lists of crime in Ireland and the number of guardians of the peace which the government deems requisite to maintain order is absolutely comic. Dublin, with the same population approximately as San Francisco, has just three times its police force. The latter has four hundred, Dublin eleven hundred. The constabulary through the rest of the country number twelve thousand, or about the same proportion for a crimeless rural population as for a crowded city. The difficulty in killing time of the official guardians of the peace is ludicrous when they are not deliberately employed in some work of petty persecution ordered by the Castle authorities. I was in a Tipperary town in July on a fair day, and passing the constabulary barrack I noticed a dozen able bodied men in uniforms engaged at midday in casting shoulder weights in their back yard. Their presence was wholly needless in the fair itself. The cost to the Irish people of this valuable body is over five million dollars annually. One-sixth of the number would be ample for all practical purposes, and the four million dollars expended on them would more than maintain the whole indigent population now supported by the Irish rate payers from their small earnings. The cost of the constabulary is much greater than the whole amount now spent on public education in Ireland.

In face of the figures just given it is needless to seek the cause of the present decadence of material prosperity in Ireland in the moral character of the people or their indulgence in drink, as some narrow though well meaning individuals are in the habit of doing in America. The simple fact is that the ruling class in the British Empire are still bent on maintaining a system of control over every branch of Irish government in their own hands. That system was avowedly framed to prevent Irish interests from thriving to any extent dangerous to those of England, commercial or political. During more than two hundred years successive rulers of England tried to force the religious system devised to further English political theories on the Catholic population of Ireland. The trial was exceptionally severe on the latter, but they held their religious faith all through it, though the English Catholics, who were nearly half the population at the accession of James Stuart, gradually abandoned theirs. The dominant ideas in the English governing class are now little concerned with religion in any shape. They are likewise much changed as regards the value of military glory or feudal supremacy over subject nations. Mammon has risen above Moloch as the national deity of the empire, and its interests are now mainly his own. The real motive for the interference of English statesmen

in the government of Ireland is to draw as much money as possible from the latter and prevent her people interfering with the commercial interests of England by competition. The programme has been carried out so thoroughly that it is well nigh impossible for the population of Ireland even to live under its burthens. If they are to exist, they must shake off the yoke, and though the task is a hard one, it is not harder than the maintenance of their religion through the penal laws.

It is necessary, however, to find the weapons with which the contest has to be fought. It is not now a question of arms and military discipline, but one of knowledge and thorough training in the ways and secrets of business life. That does not mean that Irish ideals and Irish faith are to be cast aside as incompatible with business success. It means that secular knowledge, close business training and intelligent coöperation for business ends of all classes in Ireland must henceforth be part of Ireland's national programme. The relations in those respects between the English and Irish population to-day are not unlike those between the trained soldiers of the Turkish Sultans of old and the inheritors of Christianity and Greek civilization in the remnant of the Roman Empire. The higher race morally and intellectually went down to slavery to the lower in all but skill in weapons and military discipline. The business knowledge and habits of the present day must be learned by the Irish people to a more thorough degree than they now possess them. The task, it would seem, will largely be one of education and determination, and its accomplishment is within the reach of the people's power even now.

BRYAN J. CLINCH.

Dublin.

THE TRAINING OF THE TEACHER.

THE rise and development of the parochial school system is a phenomenon which has of late years been attracting more and more of the attention of non-Catholic educators. Meetings of educational bodies, as well as educational journals, to say nothing of the popular press, furnish evidence of how closely our schools are being studied, and of how keenly felt is their claim to effective rivalry of the public schools. The phenomenon, even apart from the religious question involved, is indeed striking enough to elicit the attention and earnest study of all who are

sincerely interested in the progress of popular education. It may be questioned if the history of education affords an example of the development of a system of schools on so comprehensive a scale, in so short a period of time and in the face of difficulties so real and so great. The parochial school system of to-day is practically a creation of the past fifty years. Instead of the few scattered parish schools existing at the middle of the last century, there are now many thousands of schools, organized on a national plan, and to be found in every State and Territory and in almost every city and town. The handful of teachers—many of them of the most makeshift character—has grown into a great army of trained religious, consecrating to the work of Christian education all the energies of their noble and unselfish lives. The primitive log cabins or cheerless frame houses wherein our fathers received their simple lessons have given place to ornamental and commodious buildings of brick or stone. The few thousands of Catholic school children have increased to almost a million. In some dioceses practically the entire Catholic population of elementary school age is enrolled in the parochial schools. Throughout the country as a whole, one-half the Catholic population of school age attends Catholic schools of one kind or another. If we take into account the fact that fully one-half the public school enrollment is for rural districts, and the further fact that Catholics who live in rural districts cannot be expected as yet, from the nature of the circumstances, to provide separate schools, it will be seen that the great body of Catholics in cities and towns are loyally supporting the parochial schools and faithfully sending their children to them.

American Catholics are, relatively speaking, poor. Comparatively few of them have been, up to the present, blessed with a superabundance of the goods of this world. Yet they have spent more money, and are spending more money to-day, on popular education than any other denomination or class of citizens. Of the school taxes, which have grown so great and burdensome that it has become a matter of the utmost difficulty to get legislatures to increase them further, notwithstanding the fact that multitudes of children in our great cities are left without proper school facilities, Catholics pay their full share, although they are unable conscientiously to make use of those common educational agencies to which they are thereby entitled. In addition to this, they are paying half as much again for the purpose of giving their children such an education as they deem indispensable for right living and good citizenship. The actual expenditure on the parochial schools of New York city during the past year, including the cost of maintenance and the interest on property investment, averaged thirteen dollars per capita of school

attendance.¹ On the basis of this average, the parochial schools throughout the entire country would have cost during the same period about twelve million dollars; and, on the same basis, the expenditure on parochial schools during the past twenty years would be in the neighborhood of two hundred millions of dollars. This does not include the cost of buildings or property. A rough estimate gives a total of one hundred and thirty millions as the present value of school buildings and property. We may, therefore, reckon the total amount of money Catholics have spent on the parochial schools during the past twenty years to be well over three hundred millions of dollars. And most of this vast sum has come out of the pockets of those whose economic condition makes them painfully conscious of the burdens of taxation imposed for the support of the public schools.

But there is another side to this educational development, one which, even more than the remarkable features of numerical growth and financial outlay, is calculated to attract the attention of non-Catholic educators. The progress of the parochial schools has been qualitative as well as quantitative. Catholic teachers have, in general, been prompt to avail themselves of the aid of whatever light the science of education has been able to shed upon the difficult and delicate task of getting the child to make aright his first formal advances in the way of knowledge. The Catholic parochial school—the typical school, of course, is meant—is no longer wedded to the theory of the “Three R’s,” or to exclusively Aristotelian methods of teaching. Our best parochial schools are to-day teaching algebra and geometry in the upper grades, and have graded courses in drawing and experimental science all through the elementary years. The view that the child can best attain to his first conscious notions of number, of language and of art, as well as of science, through the medium of external objects, and that consequently the whole process of mental training ought to be based upon the observation of these, has effected a revolution in the methods of elementary teaching, and nowhere do the results more clearly indicate the change to be one of real progress than in the parochial school. It is, in fact, no longer possible to differentiate the work of the parochial school from that of the public school on the ground either of the curriculum of secular studies or of the character of the methods employed. This condition makes the real question at issue between the two systems of education stand out more clearly, and it ought to make it easier, as time goes on, for those who attempt to study the practical workings of two systems, to recognize the soundness of the

¹ Diocesan School Report, *Catholic World*, Jan., 1903.

Catholic position as to the necessity of religious instruction in the school.

These facts furnish the surest guarantee that a settlement of the vexed school question must eventually be arrived at which will lift from the shoulders of Catholics and those of other denominations who have separate schools the grievous burdens of double taxation they have now to bear. "The school question," says Bishop Spalding, "if it be ever settled at all, will be settled by facts." The strongest argument in favor of the Catholic school ought to be the school itself. The parochial school system as it actually exists, with its great disciplined organizations of teachers, with almost a million pupils, with hundreds of millions of dollars invested in school property, together with the visibly beneficent influence of the vast educational scheme upon the entire Catholic body, is doing more than all the arguments of our apologists to impress the non-Catholic mind with a sense of the justice of the Catholic position on the school question. And if the parochial school system were twice as strong, numerically, financially and in efficiency, our position would be, in the eyes of the public, fully twice as strong.

The efficiency of the school is directly proportionate to the character and equipment of the teacher. To gauge the value of an educational system it is only necessary to ascertain the character, the standards and the methods of its teachers' training schools. If we are to convince the world that our schools are as good as others, we must be prepared to show, first of all, that our teachers are equally as good. If the parochial schools are to continue to keep abreast of the public schools, the institutions in which our teachers are trained must be the object of unceasing efforts to correct defects and to assimilate new elements of educative power. The teacher, from whatever point we may view the matter, must be regarded as the dominant factor in the problem of the future of our schools.

Such was evidently the conviction of the Fathers of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore. After insisting upon the duty of providing Catholic schools, whenever possible, and of making them such as to be "in no wise inferior to the public schools," they go on to point out the means by which the parochial schools may be brought to that "state of efficiency and perfection which the honor of the Church, the interests of the pupil, temporal as well as eternal, and the generous loyalty of the laity unquestionably demand and deserve." Chief among these means they place the training of the teacher. "Since the condition and growth of our schools depends principally upon the quality of the teachers, the greatest care must be taken that none but those who are thoroughly qualified should be permitted to teach." Accordingly they prescribe, as a rule to

be everywhere observed, that each candidate must give proof, in a fair examination, of sufficient ability and training before being given a license to teach. The Council strongly urges the erection of normal schools for both lay and religious teachers, and recommends that the curriculum embrace all that the candidate may be expected to teach, as well as all that educational science and experience can tell as to the best methods of teaching. It desires especially that the teachers in these normal schools shall be themselves competent for their work. They are to unite to great natural ability a mastery of not only the academic branches, but also of methods, and of all that is comprised to-day under the broad title of pedagogy or the science of education. The end to be kept in view is "that the parochial schools may continue to grow stronger and more efficient, and may prove to be a source of pride, of hope and of strength to the State no less than to the Church."²

The idea of the professional training of the teacher had its roots in the fruitful soil of the Renaissance. The conception of education as a science followed logically from the growth of the other sciences, and its perfectibility was proved by the progress made along so many other lines of inductive inquiry. The germ of the modern normal school is first found in the professorial seminary of the Jesuit curriculum. Mulcaster, in England, advocated the professional training of teachers as early as 1581. But it was La Salle who first gave definite shape to the new theory, and embodied it in an institutional form which has remained, to a great extent, the model of all subsequent efforts in the same direction. A great impetus was given to the cause of popular education by the training school he set up at Rheims in 1681, and more especially by the religious order he established to carry on the work. In Germany the ideas of La Salle made even a deeper and more permanent impression. Francke and Hecker labored with enthusiasm to incorporate schools for the training of teachers into the slowly evolving system of Prussian national education, and with such success and excellent effects that under Frederick the Great the schools of Berlin attracted the attention of all Europe. So beneficial, in fact, were the effects seen to be that in the great educational reform which marked the rejuvenation of Prussia, after the Napoleonic wars, the normal school was definitely and permanently fixed as the central agency in the system of national primary education.

From Germany the normal school idea gradually made its way to the other countries of Europe, and eventually to America, where, previous to the time of Horace Mann, the special preparation of teachers for their work had been almost wholly neglected. So

² *Acta et Decreta*, n. 202 seq.

late as 1837 Mann was able to say of Massachusetts: "Engaged in the common schools of this State there are now, out of the city of Boston, but few more than one hundred male teachers who devote themselves to teaching as a regular profession. The number of females is a little though not materially larger. Very few even of these have ever had any special training for their vocation." It is worthy of note that the chief instrument he relied on in his work of educational reform was the establishment of teachers' training schools. The normal school he set up at Lexington in 1839 was soon followed by others. Since then the normal school has steadily grown in popular favor, as it has increased in efficiency and more clearly manifested its power as a permanently vivifying influence upon the common schools. Now every State and Territory has its public and its private normal schools, and it has come to be generally recognized that only through the perfecting of the methods of the normal school and its continued development, together with a wider application of the fundamental principles for which it stands, can we hope to add to or even maintain the progress that has been made thus far in the way of better teaching in the primary school.

The historic ideal of the normal school is based upon the recognition of a two-fold principle in education. Viewed as an objective process, which falls under the observation of the senses, teaching is a science, and its nature, scope and methods become legitimate subjects for scientific study. Viewed as a vital, personal function, teaching is an art, like music or painting, unanalyzable in its essence, although its products may, like those of other arts, be measured and appraised according to standards established by reason and experience.

As to teaching, considered as a science, the normal school training embraces work along two distinct lines; the means to be made use of in educating and the methods whereby the mind of the pupil may most easily and effectively be brought into organic relationship with the means to be used. The means to be used form the subject-matters of the so-called "academic" curriculum of the normal school. They are usually the same common school studies as the candidate will be called upon later on to teach; only, in the training school, they are studied in a deeper and a broader way than in the elementary school. Grammar, for instance, is not only thoroughly reviewed, but reviewed in the light of a knowledge of literature and modern languages. Arithmetic is gone over again, and its principles illustrated by problems of greater perplexity; but it is now taught in such a way as to show its connection with algebra and geometry. Accompanying this deeper review-study is the ever present problem of how to present the matter most effectively to

the mind of the elementary pupil. To study in this way is, as Dr. Harris has pointed out, to study subjects "constructively." It is to study the subject itself, and at the same time, its educational value to the pupil. This "constructive" study of the subjects of the elementary school curriculum may be said to be the distinctive characteristic of the normal school.

Hand in hand with the "constructive" study of the academic branches, there is the study of method. As the work of the teacher is to direct and quicken the process by which the faculties of the child spontaneously unfold and develop, so the study of method, or the adaptation of means to this end, must be based upon a knowledge of the child-mind. The mind to be educated is the first and fundamental term in the educational equation, and psychology can form the only rational basis of methodology or the science of educational methods. By giving us a fuller and more scientific knowledge of the laws of mental growth, psychology enables us to improve upon the methods which instinct, guided by a dearly bought experience, had fixed upon and made traditional in the school. Practice had taught men how the elemental forces of nature might be made to yield light and heat, easily and conveniently, ages before the birth of chemistry and physics; but how much more easily and conveniently the same forces have been made to do the work since chemistry and physics have enabled us to understand the laws which underlay the older methods. Psychology, similarly, has already done much to lighten and illuminate the teacher's task. New methods have been introduced, while many of the older methods of teaching and discipline have been modified or altogether dropped. New light has been shed upon many problems of the school room which are still unsolved, and in the effort now being made to bring to the test of ascertained laws of mental growth such questions as examination, grading, fatigue, the relative values of individual and class instruction, and the like, we have a prospect which is full of promise for the future of elementary education.

But it is with the principles of psychology the teacher has to deal, rather than with its study as an experimental science. Psychological experimentation can have no legitimate place in the elementary school, and the too frequent disregard of this truth is responsible for much of the existing prejudice against the study of psychology in the training school. The abandonment of traditional methods merely because of their being "old fashioned," would be to go to an extreme the opposite of conservatism. All sound and genuine progress must be based upon the achievements of the past; hence the need of educational history and the important place this newly created branch of knowledge has come to occupy in the curriculum

of the normal school. The study of the history of education is calculated to give breadth of view in dealing with current problems, and to quicken the teacher's enthusiasm through acquaintance with the work and spirit of the great educators of the past. The growth of interest in this field of educational work, as evidenced by the increasing literature of the subject and the increasing emphasis put upon it in the training of the teacher, is a substantial proof that the normal school movement rests upon a firm pedagogical foundation, and that, while educators are eagerly reaching out on every side to lay hold of whatever may be of aid to the further advancement of the school, there need be no fear that any good or useful element in the successes of the past will be overlooked or lightly laid aside.

The normal school recognizes that education is an art as well as a science. Knowledge of the academic branches and of pedagogy does not necessarily imply pedagogical skill. The teacher may know enough, and yet fail through practical inability to apply his knowledge properly. Enthusiasm and high ideals cannot, of themselves, prevent the formation of habits which militate against success. The work of the normal school could not be regarded as complete if its graduates were allowed to go out from it without ever having had a chance to put its principles to the test of actual practice, and left to make their first trial of teaching under circumstances precluding the help of friendly advice or assistance. The theological student in the seminary is not only taught how to prepare and deliver sermons, but is given practice in preaching. The law student practices the art of pleading and the trial of cases. The student of medicine is made to give evidence of his ability to diagnose and operate before being allowed to start out as a physician. Why should not the teacher, whose art is certainly not less difficult or subtle than that of the preacher, the lawyer or the doctor, be given some practice in teaching as a part of his professional training? The conviction of the necessity of this has been strong from the very beginning. In connection with his training school for teachers at Paris, La Salle set up an elementary school, wherein the young masters were to be exercised in teaching under the supervision of an experienced Brother, while continuing their studies. Herbart established a similar institution at Konigsburg, in 1809, in connection with his pedagogical seminary. The growth of normal schools in our country was soon followed by the custom of requiring their students to teach in neighboring elementary schools, as a part of regular curriculum. Nearly all our public normal schools now require practice teaching, in one form or another. In the normal schools of France and Germany, as well as England, it is

regarded as an essential, and no candidate is admitted to the ranks of the professional teachers without having made trial, under competent supervision, of his fitness to carry on the actual work of the class room.

In endeavoring to determine the extent to which the training of the Catholic teacher has been influenced by the great educational movement represented by the normal school, it must be remembered that the movement was distinctly Catholic in its origin. Its essential principles were woven into the rules and constitutions of the great religious order created by the founder of the first normal school, and most of the teaching communities which have been established since are modeled more or less upon the order of La Salle. In certain important respects, as we shall see, the Catholic teaching orders represent the most perfect development of the fundamental idea for which the normal school stands.

It must be remembered, too, that nearly all the teachers in the parochial schools to-day are members of the religious orders. In studying the growth of the parochial school system two tendencies are noticed which were evident from the very beginning, but which have become specially manifest during the last half century. One is the replacement of male teachers by women. The other is the replacement of lay teachers—both men and women—by religious. A quarter of a century ago lay teachers were quite common in the parochial schools, especially in the Middle Western States. To-day they are rarely to be found, and where they are, it is usually in the capacity of assistants to the regular teachers. The gradual disappearance of male teachers from the elementary schools seems to be due chiefly to economic causes, just as in the case of the public schools. At present less than one-twentieth of the teachers in the parochial schools are men, and even this slight proportion appears to be on the decrease. Nearly all of these belong to religious orders. Many of them are really teaching classes of high school grade in connection with parochial schools, and there is a growing tendency on the part of the teaching brotherhoods to concentrate their work in the field of secondary education. Catholic elementary education is to-day, therefore, almost entirely in the hands of the religious orders of women. These orders are very numerous. The Catholic Directory recognizes 85 distinct teaching communities of women, the combined membership of which is upward of 40,000. Some of these communities have less than 100 religious, while many are comparatively large, the largest numbering about 3,000 members. Some are diocesan, that is, their work is confined to a single diocese; but, as a rule, the establishments of each order range through a number of States, and not a few have schools in every section of the country and in almost every State.

These facts suggest two very important advantages of the Catholic teacher, as compared with the teacher in the public school. In the first place, the Catholic teacher takes up teaching as a life profession, and is, as a rule, a teacher for life. The members of each of these religious orders form a body of truly professional teachers. As religious they have bound themselves by solemn obligations to continue to teach as long as health and strength shall permit them to be of service, according to the prudent judgment of their superiors. They have deliberately shut out all prospect and all possibility, morally speaking, of a change of occupation. They have identified the highest conceivable ideal of human life with the ideal of the teaching profession. The consciousness of having engaged in teaching as a life profession, out of love for it and appreciation of its sacredness and worth, is an inexhaustible fountain of interest, of enthusiasm and of strength for the teacher; and, in the eyes of the Catholic public, this fact alone suffices to stamp the work of the teacher in the parochial school with an authority and value which no degree of personal ability could otherwise confer. Moreover, the environment of the Catholic teacher is calculated to continue the work of the training school by fostering the growth of a professional spirit, stimulating to study and broadening and enriching the teacher's educational experience. The members of the teaching orders live apart from the world, free alike from its exciting pleasures and its harassing cares. They are not bothered about salaries. They have no increase to look forward to. They receive very little, only about one-third to one-half of what public school teachers in the primary grades of city schools get, and it is only by the severe simplicity of their mode of life and the exercise of a rigid economy that they are enabled to get along.³ They live in common, in groups varying from three to thirty, and are thus enabled to live very cheaply. Their life centres about the school, and they may be said to be never wholly out of its atmosphere. Their house is next to the school—often consisting, in fact, of a portion of the school building. The school enters into their conversations, their recreations, their prayers. There is daily discussion of its incidents, its interests, its problems and its difficulties. There are frequent conferences on educational topics, while several hours every day they are required by their rule to give to individual study. It is easy to see that such a life, even considered apart from the deep and all pervasive religious spirit which inspires it, is favorable, in the highest

³ The salaries of Sisters teaching in the parochial schools rarely rise above \$250 per annum, while in some cases it falls as low as \$100. More commonly it is from \$150 to \$200 per annum. Salaries of Brothers who teach in the schools are generally about twice as much.

degree, to the development of those qualities of mind and heart which go to make the strong, experienced and successful teacher.

On the other hand, the teachers in the public schools, speaking generally, can scarcely be said to be a body of professional teachers at all. It is the exception, rather than the rule, that they are teachers for life. The greater number serve but for short periods. A competent authority has calculated that the average length of the professional career of the public school teacher is only between seven and eight years.⁴ In certain States and localities, it is even less than that. It appears to fluctuate with economic conditions, becoming greater in periods of business depression and less in prosperous times. With the greater number, teaching seems to be primarily a matter of bread and butter, rather than of natural taste or aptitude.⁵ The situation has been satirized by saying that "the profession of teaching seems to be a kind of waiting room, in which the young girl awaits a congenial, ulterior support, and the young man a more advantageous position."⁶ A distinguished German educator has characterized this condition of things as being "next to political influence the most vulnerable point in the whole American school system," adding that "it is evident that the achievements of even a highly gifted people must fall below a high standard under such a régime."⁷ The present widespread agitation for the increase of teachers' salaries is a recognition of this defect, and a laudable effort to remedy it, by offering greater inducements to capable young men and women to take up teaching as a profession and make it their life occupation.

A second fundamental advantage of the parochial school, derived from the religious character of the teacher, is the opportunity for a more extended course of professional preparation enjoyed by the members of the religious communities. It is a *sine qua non* condition for entrance into the religious life that the candidate must devote at least one year to serious reflections and preparation. In the case of the teaching orders, this year is devoted chiefly to the work of the normal school. There are religious exercises every day, but the greater part of the time is taken up in the class-room and the study-hall. All parochial school teachers, therefore, may be said to have at least one year of normal school instruction, or its equivalent, before being sent out to teach.

But the year of training in the novitiate does not represent all the Catholic teacher receives in the way of professional training.

⁴ President Schurman, of Cornell, *Education in the United States*, V. I., p. 377.

⁵ *Educational Review*, Nov., 1900, p. 415.

⁶ Report of the Bureau of Ed., 1892-3, p. 545.

⁷ *Ibid*, p. 566.

The novitiate course is regarded as only the upper grade of the normal school curriculum. Prerequisite for entrance into the novitiate, the orders have, as a rule, a course of training known as the postulate. This period is supposed to last generally for two years, so that the length of the regular course of the Catholic normal school may be set down as three years. As a matter of fact, the great majority of candidates for the teaching orders either omit the postulate altogether or spend but a few weeks in it. In some cases this is done because the candidate has already had the studies of the postulate, but more often it is due to the actual necessity of keeping up the supply of teachers in the schools.

Besides the novitiate and postulate, the summer school must be taken into account as an agency for the training of the Catholic teacher. All the important teaching orders now have summer schools for the benefit of the teachers engaged in the parochial schools. The work usually lasts from four to six weeks, and from two to four hours per day. The courses cover the whole range of the curriculum of the primary and often of the secondary school, and are in the nature of advanced graded studies of the common school topics, from the teacher's standpoint. In addition, there are lectures of a general character on literature, science, art and pedagogy by distinguished educators, both lay and clerical. The teachers of the regular classes are usually the pick of the order, being drawn from the faculties of its leading schools, academies and colleges. The summer school of the religious order has thus a definite and regularly graded curriculum of studies which distinguishes it from the ordinary teachers' institute, and makes it worthy of being classed with such high-grade summer schools as Chataqua and Martha's Vineyard.

From this outline of the work of the Catholic training school it is evident that the teacher in the parochial schools has, on the average, a great advantage over the public school teacher in the way of professional training. According to the Secretary of the National Educational Association, seventy-five per cent. of the teachers in the public schools have received no professional training whatever.⁸ It is not hard to understand the reason why from what has been already said of the non-professional character of public school teachers in general. The renewal of the entire teaching body on the average of once in every seven or eight years makes it impossible for the normal schools to turn out teachers fast enough to supply the demand. The late Professor Hinsdale calculated, on the basis of the returns for 1896-7, that at least forty thousand recruits would

⁸ Report of the National Educational Association, 1899, p. 893.

be needed annually to take the place of those who quit the service.⁹ But this was more than three times the number of normal graduates that year, and more than one-half the total number of students in all the normal schools and classes in the country. Since trained teachers cannot be got, the best that can be had are hired, and these are generally young women who take up teaching simply as a convenient and easy means of gaining a livelihood for the time being. The non-professional character of the teaching body thus reproduces itself continually. The constant dropping out of teachers makes it necessary to gather in from the highways and the byways in order to fill up the ranks; and the makeshift character of most of the recruits produces in time a crop of new vacancies, which have to be filled in the same way. Not only is there no special preparation for their work in the case of the greater number, but the intellectual equipment of many who are given a license to teach is of the slenderest sort. It has been computed that only about fifteen per cent. of the whole number of teachers in the public schools are normal school graduates, while seventeen per cent. are inexperienced beginners.¹⁰ It is not uncommon to find teachers in the elementary school who have never finished a high school course, and often enough they have never gone farther than the grades of the elementary school.

The course of studies in the normal schools of the religious orders lasts, as has been shown, for three years, at least in theory. In a general way, it may be said that the academic work of this course does not differ substantially from that of the ordinary three years' curriculum of the public normal school. The studies of the first year are subjects ordinarily taught in the elementary school—English, arithmetic, history, geography, drawing and music. During the second year the studies are those of the higher grammar and lower high school grades. Arithmetic is continued, and in addition, composition, rhetoric and literature are taken up, as well as the elementary sciences, especially botany and physiology. Book-keeping is also frequently introduced in this year. The third year is devoted to high school or academy work—the studies being English literature, modern history, civics, algebra and geometry, the modern and ancient languages. There is, of course, considerable deviation from this curriculum, but, on the whole, it may be regarded as typical. It represents what is actually being done in the normal schools of the larger and more progressive communities. It is the ideal which all the communities are striving to reach,

⁹ Ed. in the U. S., V. I., p. 376.

¹⁰ Ibid, p. 377.

and which most of them have succeeded in realizing more or less perfectly.

A remarkable feature of the work of the religious training schools is the comparative neglect of the formal study of pedagogy. The curriculum of both the postulate and novitiate consists almost entirely of the academic branches. Many normal schools have nothing at all in the way of psychology, methodology or educational history, while those that teach pedagogy are content, as a rule, with a brief course of psychology in the last year, and a single course in the theory and practice of teaching, such as that given in Page's "Manual of Teaching," which is in some places used as a text book. There is no observation work, properly so called, and no practice in actual teaching.

This neglect of the study of pedagogy—both as a science and as an art—must be regarded as a serious defect in the curricula of our training schools. It may be admitted that the teaching of the academic branches is fairly well done. The teachers, while without any special pedagogical training themselves, know what they are called upon to teach. They have taught in the best schools of the order. They have had abundant experience, and their experience has crystallized out, to some extent, in sound and definite principles of educational practice. They are, therefore, qualified to direct that "constructive" study of the common school branches which is, as we have seen, the thing of fundamental importance for the teacher. The best proof of the thoroughness which characterizes the work of the religious normal school, so far as the work goes, is the quality of the teaching in the parochial schools. It has been frequently observed that the work of the parochial schools, especially in those studies which are commonly designated as "the Three R's," is, in point of drill and practical effectiveness, superior to that of the public schools.

Yet, as our object must be, not merely to equal the public schools or to surpass them, but simply to make our schools the best possible, to bring them up to the highest degree of efficiency we can, the study of the academic branches cannot be regarded as sufficient for the proper training of our teachers. The studies of the elementary school are merely the tools with which the teacher works. She must be able to handle them with skill and mastery, but this alone will not suffice. There must be some knowledge of the nature of the child-mind, which is the material upon which she works. There must be some scientific knowledge of the educational process. There must be the ability to view this process in the whole, as the adaptation of means to end, and the skill to adapt the means to the character and needs of the individual pupil when circumstances

require. The primary purpose of the teacher, we have come to see, is not to store the mind with information or supply it with a body of principles which may serve as an unfailing well-spring of right moral motives, but simply to supply the conditions needed for the development of the mind's own native powers. The educational process is essentially one of self-development. The determinative impulse to mental development must come from within. Mental growth results from the assimilation of new truth, just as bodily growth comes from the fresh nourishment taken into the system. But in neither case will it do to force the process; the assimilation must come about naturally and spontaneously if it is to result in permanent good. By mere power of drill, the pupil may be made to see that a given proposition is true, and yet the impression produced may be only evanescent. The work of the teacher is to establish a vital connection between the proposition as a bit of demonstrable truth and the mind of the pupil. This can be done only by arousing the pupil's interest, and the study of how to do this, for all kinds of minds, and under all sorts of circumstances, is the study of educational method.

Certain laws of momentum seem to apply to the movements of the mind, as they do to the motions of material bodies. It is a fact of every day observation, for instance, that once the interests and energies of the mind are aroused and stimulated in a given direction, they continue to tend in the same direction. The bent of the mind through life is generally determined, or at least largely influenced, by its impulse at the start. The ideal of life toward which the self-educative growth of the pupil in the school has been shaped usually continues to be the ideal of the man or woman in subsequent years. This is equally true of mental methods and habits acquired during the school years. Hence the importance of forming the mind of a pupil to correct habits of thought from the very beginning. Hence, too, the importance of correcting mistaken methods, whether in the teacher or the pupil, before they become inveterate. The work of the young teacher needs careful and competent supervision, no less than that of the most elementary pupil.

As a matter of fact, experience proves that knowledge of the subjects she is to teach, however thorough it may be, does not prevent the young teacher from making mistakes in method, or afford sufficient security against the danger of such mistakes becoming inveterate. Usually, without ever having had the slightest experience in the way of teaching, the religious, on finishing the novitiate, is sent out to face a class of forty or fifty pupils in a parochial school. There is no time to observe the methods of the older teachers in the school. There is no direct supervision, the

superior or superintendent of the school being busy with her own classes. For a time, therefore, the work of the young teacher is apt to resolve itself into a sort of "struggle for existence." The work has to be done. The school has to go on. Order must be kept, and the pupils kept busy—the busier the better. Until she is sure of herself and of her control of the class, the teacher can do little in the way of arousing that intelligent, self-active interest of the pupils in their work which is as the very life-blood of knowledge. She is forced to fall back upon discipline and authority, and vainly seeks to arouse interest by inspiring fear of punishment or hope of gain. Her teaching, in consequence, becomes formal, mechanical and to a great extent fruitless. The pupils suffer, and the teacher suffers. Thrown practically upon her own resources, without adequate preparation for her work, with no direct supervision, it would be too much to expect the teacher of no more than average ability to pass through such a period of trial and struggle without making mistakes and falling into methods and habits calculated to tell against the efficiency of her teaching later on.

"That the untried teacher should, alone and unaided, begin to experiment with a class of pupils," says one of our most capable and experienced diocesan superintendents, "is unjust to the children and disheartening to herself. Pedagogical ability should have been acquired before she assumes sole charge of a class.

"There is wanting in the novitiates a very important feature of the normal school, properly so called—that is, a 'model' or 'practice' school, wherein candidates for the position of teacher may see the most approved methods in the various grades practically demonstrated by experienced, skillful teachers; and wherein they also, at certain periods, may make their first essays in teaching, under efficient supervision. The helpfulness of such a model school can hardly be overestimated. While observing the work of the experienced teacher, novices would receive inspiration for their future life-work, and in their efforts to teach, under sympathetic, skillful guidance, would acquire like skill and become more confident of their own ability."¹¹

The establishment of such model and practice schools in connection with the training schools of the religious orders would involve no great difficulty. Side by side with the novitiate there is usually an academy of the same order for outside pupils, with a primary department, comprising all the elementary grades. It would be easy, therefore, for candidates in the novitiate, while pursuing the study of the academic branches and of pedagogy, to observe

¹¹ Report of the Superintendent of Schools for the Archdiocese of Philadelphia for the year 1901-2.

the work of skilled teachers in the same grades as they themselves are to teach. Our religious normal schools have a special advantage in the fact that, while the number of pupils in these elementary departments of the academies is generally large, the number of students in the normal school is small, seldom rising above forty, and more commonly varying between one and two dozen. It would thus be feasible to give to each candidate in the normal school an opportunity to teach for a sufficient length of time, and to enable the teaching of each to have the benefit of careful and competent supervision.

But practice teaching cannot be done to advantage during the postulate or the novitiate. There is not time enough for it, and until there has been a thorough grounding in the academic branches, it would be worse than a waste of time. On the other hand, it would be practically impossible to prolong the novitiate. The need of teachers is too great. It is difficult enough, as it is, to meet the demand without curtailing or postponing the novitiate. It would be possible, however, to afford the novices a year of additional training, without any notable diminution thereby of the actual teaching force of the order, if those who are destined for the parochial schools were left to teach for a year or two in the elementary departments of the academies after completing their novitiate. Their work in this way could be done under the supervision of an experienced teacher or of several teachers, who could take charge of the higher and more difficult classes themselves, and who would be responsible for the quality of the instruction throughout. By this arrangement the candidate, by completing the novitiate, instead of going out at once to teach in the parochial schools, would remain for a year at least at the mother house, or at one of the other academies of the order, teaching meanwhile classes practically the same as those of the parochial school. Besides daily revision of the lesson plans for each class, the supervising teacher would pay daily visits to the class rooms, and, at the end of the day, assemble the young teachers in conference, to comment on her observations, discuss practical difficulties, and, in general, give them the benefit of her experience in dealing with the various problems of the school room. Once a week or so there might be a conference upon special pedagogical topics, while, in many cases, the novice would be able also to follow a class or two in the academy or the normal school. This arrangement would involve little, if any, lessening of the order's actual teaching force. It is substantially the plan of practice teaching favored by the best educational thought of the day, and the possible objection that it would involve a lowering of the standard of teaching in the elementary depart-

ments of the academies is disproved by the experience of normal school students teaching in public elementary schools under similar conditions.

But to introduce the formal study of methods into the novitiate, and to add a year of practice teaching afterward, under competent supervision, presupposes teachers for the novitiate and the academy who have had the benefit of a superior training in pedagogy. The training of the teacher of the normal school ought to be as much above that of the parochial school teacher as the work of the latter surpasses that of her pupils. The curriculum of the ordinary normal school ought to be at least of high school grade; and the teacher of the normal school should, therefore, have made a college or university course. Similarly, the teachers of higher collegiate classes in the academies ought to have made post-graduate studies. There exists as yet no adequate provision in any of our Catholic institutions for the training of these two classes of teachers—teachers for the normal schools and teachers for the higher classes of the academies. Some of the stronger academies have, within recent years, established post-graduate courses, but these courses are not designed especially for the training of teachers. Besides, one of the chief obstacles in the way of this post-graduate development—which is so full of promise for the future of our academies—is the lack of any suitable institution to which the religious orders of women might send their subjects for a post-graduate training.

The fundamental and immediate need, therefore, whether we view the situation from the standpoint of the parochial school or of the academy, is for the establishment of a higher normal school for the training of teachers. More than a decade ago Bishop Spalding, in insisting upon the necessity of unceasing efforts toward educational progress, pointed out that, in order to improve the parochial schools, "means must be found to increase the efficiency of our teaching communities of women." To this end he advocated the establishment of a "central normal school, a sort of educational university." The curriculum to comprise the history of education, theories of education, psychology and physiology, in their bearings upon education, methods of education, philosophy and literature, with the classical languages and special sciences; the lecture halls and class rooms to be in a central building, and around this the various teaching communities to establish houses for their younger religious.¹²

There is every reason to believe an institution of this kind would be successful. The need is common to all the communities, and as no one of them could afford to establish such a school for the exclu-

¹² *Catholic World*, April, 1890.

sive benefit of its own teachers, there ought to be a central foundation, common to all, or several such, advantageously situated. The difference of community rules and spirit would not constitute a serious difficulty. This objection would be obviated by the plans suggested above, of a central building for lecture halls, class rooms, etc., with houses of the various communities grouped about it, so that the young religious might follow their regular rule of life, under their own superiors.

Or the plan might be followed which has proved so successful in the great school for the training of religious teachers at Bruges, in Belgium. This institution, which is recognized by the State, was founded in 1859, and is in charge of Les Dames De Saint Audré, whose superior general selects the professors, with the approval of the Minister of Public Instruction. The course of study is for four years. No lay students are received, and students are admitted only on examination. In spiritual matters, the institution is under the direction of a chaplain, who is appointed by the Bishop of the diocese. Simple, practical rules of religious life, approved by the Ordinary, govern the daily life of the students, and are the same for all. The religious in charge have their own community exercises, apart from the pupils; but one of them is always present at the latter to preside. Their own Sisters who follow the normal course live in community with them instead of with the general body of the students. As a further safeguard against any temptation on the part of the students to be drawn away from their own communities, the Sisters of St. Audré have a rule that no religious from another order who has ever been a student at the normal school can be admitted to their community. That these arrangements have worked satisfactorily is shown by the fact that, during the year 1898-9, the school was attended by 125 religious, representing 63 distinct religious communities; while out of the 90 congregations of women which have establishments in the Diocese of Bruges, 85 have sent students to this normal school.

Nearly all our great secular institutions have, within recent years, established higher normal schools, such as suggested, and placed the science and art of teaching on a plane with the learned professions. The object has been to afford a higher professional training to teachers in normal schools and high schools, as well as those who may be ambitious to fit themselves for positions of special responsibility in the way of public school administration or supervision, such as superintendents and principals. At Teachers' College, in New York city, for instance, which may be taken as the typical representative of this new class of normal schools, there is an undergraduate department, modeled upon the ordinary college

curriculum of four years, the first two years being given to the study of the academic branches the candidate expects to teach, and the last two to professional studies, observation work and practice teaching. There is also a graduate department, consisting of advanced courses in the subjects of the college curriculum and leading to university degrees.

It is evident that we are entering upon a new era of normal school development, an era in which the university seems destined to do for the teacher of the normal school what the normal school has done for the teacher in the elementary grades. The Catholic teaching orders occupy a position of peculiar advantage here. The offspring of the original normal school movement inaugurated by La Salle, their very existence and character as teaching bodies are based upon the idea of the professional training of the teacher, and whatever pedagogical advantages the parochial schools possess in comparison with the public schools, are due chiefly to the fact that this fundamental idea of the normal school has reached its fullest development thus far in the religious orders. They ought to be the first, therefore, to take advantage of this new educational movement, representing, as it does, only the continued development of the normal school along the lines of its original foundation. The establishment of Catholic teachers' colleges will stimulate the growth of the teaching orders and develop more fully their vast latent pedagogical resources. It will remedy serious defects in their present training courses. It will insure, as nothing else can, the continued growth and progress of the parochial schools. It will furnish a convincing proof to the non-Catholic mind as to the value of the work that is being done in Catholic schools, and will thus be another step in the direction of that synthesis of parochial school and common school educational systems which is so greatly to be desired.

J. A. BURNS, C. S. C.

Washington, D. C.

THE PAPACY AS A NAVAL POWER.

STORIA DELLA MARINA PONTIFICIA. 9 vols. and Atlas of 100 Plates. Rome, 1886-1893. By Padre Alberto Guglielmotti, O. P.

IT MAY seem strange that a government which, like that of the Holy See, has always been regarded as feeble and unwarlike, and which, during the Middle Ages, has often found it difficult to maintain its authority over the City of Rome, should ever have been distinguished as a naval power, and that for many centuries the defense of the coasts of the Mediterranean against piracy

should have been mainly due to its fleets. It is, indeed, a well authenticated fact, though one to which historians have not, as a rule, directed sufficient attention, that the successors of St. Peter have always been the vigilant and unwearied guardians of Christianity against Mahometanism; and it is certain that, if the other sovereigns of Europe had listened to their warning voice and responded to their appeals for help, the Emperors of the East might still be reigning at Constantinople, and some of the fairest provinces of Asia and of Europe would have been preserved from the despotism of the Turk.

The history of these long forgotten campaigns has been written by a learned Dominican, Padre Alberto Guglielmotti, who was born in 1812 at Civit  Vecchia, one of the chief seaports of the Papal States, of a family which had often sent representatives to serve on board the warships of the Holy See. He entered the order of St. Dominic at the age of fifteen, and for many years he taught natural philosophy and mathematics in the public schools of the Convent of Sta. Maria sopra Minervam, while at the same time he pursued his antiquarian researches among the archives of the Vatican and of the noble families of Rome. In the voluminous and erudite work which is the result of these labors, Padre Guglielmotti shows a profound knowledge of the technical details of medi val and modern seamanship, as well as of the sciences of gunnery and fortification, with regard to the development and progress of which he has furnished much new and valuable information. He has also brought to light many hitherto unknown facts in the annals of the Papacy, and he has rescued from the dusty records, where for centuries they had lain in oblivion, the memories of many brilliant and daring deeds and the names of the heroes who performed them.

Long before the Sovereign Pontiffs had acquired sufficient wealth or independence to enable them to form a fleet of their own they had on many occasions sought to persuade the maritime States of Italy to combine for the purpose of repelling the incursions of the Saracens, who were on the point of rendering themselves masters of the countries bordering upon the Mediterranean. By the end of the eighth century not only Egypt and the north of Africa, but also Spain had been conquered by the Mahometans, and in 828 they attacked Sicily. In the following year they took Civit  Vecchia, drove out the inhabitants and laid the country waste with fire and sword up to the walls of Rome; they then sailed for the opposite coast of Italy, where they burned Ancona. In the year 846 the Saracens landed at the mouth of the Tiber and made another attempt to seize Rome. The city, which was strongly fortified, was able to resist the efforts of the invaders, but they plundered the

churches and the villas outside the walls. Being at last defeated by the inhabitants of the neighboring mountains, they fled to Gaeta, where they rallied and invested the town until the arrival of troops from the northern provinces of Italy and of the fleets of Naples and Amalfi obliged them to ask for peace and they were allowed to reëmbark, but their ships were overtaken by a violent storm, and nearly all on board perished.

In spite of this loss, another army of Saracens sailed from Africa in 849 for the port of Ostia, at the mouth of the Tiber. Contrary winds drove them to seek shelter for some days off the coast of Sardinia, and this delay enabled the fleets of Naples, Amalfi and Gaeta to come to the assistance of the town, which was held by troops sent by Pope Leo IV. (847-855). In the naval combat which followed the Mahometans were defeated, their vessels which sought to escape were driven on shore by a storm, and the thousands of prisoners who were brought back to Rome were made to work on the walls which Leo IV. built round the Vatican and the Basilica of St. Peter to unite them to the rest of the city and protect them against future aggressions. To this enclosure, which still exists, was given the name of the Leonine City.

The disaster at Ostia did not, however, check the incursions of the Saracens, who continued to devastate Calabria and Apulia, which the Greek Emperors, who were still nominally the rulers of Southern Italy, were unable to defend. Such was the terror caused by their invasions that the cities of Naples, Amalfi, Capua and Gaeta, which were then almost independent of the Government of Byzantium, consented in 876 to purchase an ignominious peace from the infidels, to contract an alliance with them and to assist them in their piratical expeditions. The Duke of Gaeta even allowed the Mahometans to build a fortress at the mouth of the Garigliano, which they held for more than thirty years, and whence they made raids into the provinces of Rome and Benevento and as far north as the Duchy of Spoleto. They then laid waste the valleys of the Tiber and of the Aniene, and occupied strong positions in the mountains near Tivoli, where a village still bears their name. They also plundered the monastery of Monte Cassino, where they massacred the community and seized the monastery of Farfa, whence the monks had fled after having defended it for seven years. It was in vain that Pope John VIII. (872-882) implored the help of Charles the Bald, Emperor of the West, or of Basil, the Macedonian Emperor of the East, or sought to persuade the towns of Southern Italy to renounce their alliance with the Saracens and join their forces with his for the enfranchisement of their country. Being thus obliged to rely on his own resources, he built and armed several *dromones* or large galleys, each

rowed by 100 oars, and at their head, in March, 877, he attacked and defeated a Saracen fleet near Terracina, taking 18 galleys and freeing 600 captives.

This victory could not, unfortunately, be followed up and completed by the total expulsion of the Saracens, as the prolonged struggle between the various pretenders to the Imperial Crown which followed the death of Charles the Bald, and an invasion of the Hungarians, plunged all Northern and Central Italy for many years into a state of warfare and anarchy. It was not until the Pontificate of John X. (914-929) that a league for the expulsion of the Saracens could at last be formed among the many small States into which Italy was divided. At the voice of the Sovereign Pontiff troops flocked from all sides to the standard of the Church; the cities of Southern Italy abandoned their Mahometan allies and joined the league, and the Greek Emperor Constantine sent a powerful fleet to their assistance. In the spring of the year 916 the Pope led the army against the Saracens, who were defeated near Tivoli and driven back to their fortress on the Garigliano. The attack on this stronghold lasted for three months, when the garrison, seeing no prospect of being relieved, tried to cut its way through the besiegers and escape to the mountains, but perished in the attempt. Their destruction put an end to Mahometan invasions for more than a hundred years, and this respite, due to the patriotism and statesmanship of a Sovereign Pontiff, enabled the maritime cities of Italy to develop their institutions, to make commercial treaties with each other and to lay the foundations of their future prosperity.

This state of tranquillity was interrupted in 1015 when a Saracen fleet coming from Spain, under a Christian renegade named Mogeid, landed an army of 10,000 men in Sardinia, devastated the island and, crossing over to Tuscany, in the following year took the town of Luni. The Sovereign Pontiff then reigning, Benedict VIII. (1012-1024), immediately called the vassals of the Church to arms, formed an alliance with the Republics of Pisa and Genoa, and drove the pirates not only from Italy, but also from Sardinia, which was placed under the protection of Pisa.

It was also a Pope, Victor III. (1086-1087) who, when Mahometan corsairs were again laying waste the coasts of Italy, sent an expedition against their stronghold. With the help of the Pisans, the Genoese and the Neapolitans he assembled a fleet of 300 vessels and an army of 30,000 men, and although he died before he was able to carry out his project, his death did not suspend the execution of the undertaking, for in the following year under Urban II. (1088-1099), the army, which was led by an ancestor of the house of Colonna, and which bore the standard of St. Peter, landed near Tunis, took

the town of Zavilla and the fortress of Mehedia and rescued several thousand Christian slaves.

It may have been this brilliant victory over the Saracens which induced the various nations of Europe to listen more readily to the supplications of the Holy See in favor of the Eastern Christians, which had hitherto been unsuccessful. In the beginning of the eleventh century, Sylvester II. (999-1003) had addressed an appeal to the Universal Church in the name of Jerusalem,¹ asking for assistance, or at least for alms; but the first definite project of an expedition for the deliverance of the Holy Land is due to Gregory VII. (1073-1085). In 1074 that Pontiff earnestly implored the Emperor Henry IV., the Count of Savoy and the Count of Burgundy to take up arms against the Turks, who were then beginning to penetrate into Asia Minor. In his letter to the Emperor of Germany the Holy Father states that in Italy over 50,000 men were already preparing to assist the Eastern Christians; that he hoped to lead them in person as far as to the Sepulchre of Our Lord, and that during his absence he would entrust Rome and the Church to the care of the Emperor.

The long and bitter struggle with the Imperial power in which Gregory VII. soon found himself, involved as the result of his efforts to free the Church from State control by forbidding ecclesiastics to receive the investiture of their benefices from the sovereign, put an end to these preparations, and it was reserved to Urban II. (1088-1099), the successor of Victor III., to carry out the project which Gregory VII. was the first to suggest. For that purpose, the Sovereign Pontiff convoked a Council at Piacenza in March, 1095, to which the Emperor Alexis Comnenos sent ambassadors to ask for help to enable him to defend Constantinople. His request was favorably received, but it was only at the Council of Clermont, in Auvergne, in the month of November following, that an immense assembly of clergy and laity, roused to the highest pitch of enthusiasm by the eloquence of the Holy Father, answered to his call to arms and resolved to deliver the Holy Land from the infidel.

It does not enter into the purpose of this article to relate the history of the Crusades; it is enough to recall the fact that the first Crusaders took up arms at the voice of a Pope, and that the successors of Urban II. did all in their power to assist the Christian States which were founded in the Holy Land. Thus at the beginning of the Fifth Crusade in 1218, Honorius III. (1216-1227) sent twenty ships to take part in the siege of Damietta, where the Roman troops distinguished themselves by their bravery; and in 1272

¹ *Ex persona Hierusalem devastatæ Universalis Ecclesiæ.* (Gerberti Epistola 28.)

Gregory X. (1271-1276) sent over 2,000 men to the assistance of Ptolemais; but after the death of Saint Louis at Tunis in 1270, it became impossible for the Sovereign Pontiffs to overcome the indifference which the European States manifested towards Eastern affairs. One after another the towns and fortresses of Palestine fell before the Mahometans, while the Kings of Europe, plunged in internecine warfare, remained deaf to all the appeals of the Popes, who alone seem to have been aware of the dangers which threatened all Christendom, and of the necessity of checking the progress of Islam. Ptolemais was the last great Christian stronghold which still kept the infidels at bay, and Nicolas IV. (1288-1292), unable to obtain assistance from any European State, fitted out ten galleys, hired twenty others from the Venetians and sent them with 2,500 soldiers to the relief of the besieged city. After a desperate resistance the town was taken on the 19th of May, 1291, by the Sultan of Egypt, Malek el Aschraf, but the Papal galleys succeeded in saving a large number of the inhabitants and transporting them to the island of Cyprus. Beirut, Tyre and Sidon yielded soon after without making any resistance; their inhabitants were massacred, their buildings leveled with the ground, and with their downfall ended the dominion founded by the Crusaders in the Holy Land which the Popes had done so much to assist and preserve.

At the beginning of the fourteenth century the power of the Turks became still more formidable. They established the seat of their empire at Broussa, in Asia Minor, under the house of Othman in 1317, when they began to devastate the islands of the Ægean Sea, and they attacked Constantinople, which was saved by the bravery of the Genoese and Venetian merchants who were settled there. The Papal Court had at that time been transferred from Rome to Avignon, but even in their exile the Sovereign Pontiffs still watched over the Eastern Christians, and in 1333 Pope John XXII. (1316-1334), after long negotiations, succeeded in forming a league with Philip VI., King of France; the Greek Emperor Andronicus, the Republic of Venice, the Knights of Rhodes and the King of Cyprus, who altogether furnished a fleet of 38 galleys and 32 transports carrying 800 knights. The result of this alliance was a victory in 1334 over the Turks in the Sea of Marmora, where, in spite of their superior numbers, they lost 250 ships and 5,000 men; but at the death of the Pope, which took place in the same year, the league came to an end. The Venetians quarreled with the Genoese; war broke out between France and England; the Emperor Andronicus attacked the Knights of Rhodes, and the Turks, taking advantage of these dissensions, advanced the frontiers of their territories as far as Nicæa.

Ten years later another expedition was prepared in answer to the earnest entreaties of Pope Clement VI. (1342-1354), and in 1344 a fleet of 20 galleys, four of which were furnished by the Pope and the others by Venice, the Knights of Rhodes, the Kingdom of Cyprus and the island of Paros, took the strongly fortified port of Smyrna, which was thenceforth held by the Knights of Rhodes in the name of the Pope and of the Church until it was taken by the Mongols led by Tamerlane in 1402, when they conquered Asia Minor after having defeated Sultan Bajazet at the battle of Angora. This reverse to the Turkish arms and the civil war which ensued between the sons of Bajazet would probably have rendered it possible to reconquer Asia Minor for the Eastern Empire at the beginning of the fifteenth century, if only a permanent peace could have been established between the various States of Europe, which would have allowed them to combine for that purpose. It was not until nearly the close of his reign that Eugene IV. (1431-1447) was able to form an alliance with the Venetians and the Duke of Burgundy, and with their help to send an expedition to seize the Dardanelles and thus cut off the retreat of Sultan Amurath, who had invaded Hungary. This plan was unfortunately frustrated by the treachery of some Genoese merchants who, being heavily bribed, transported 70,000 Turks across the straits, a reinforcement which enabled the Sultan to win the battle of Varna on November 10, 1444, after two days' fighting, when Cardinal Cesarini, the Papal Legate, King Ladislaus and a large number of Polish and Hungarian nobles lost their lives.

The attempt made by Nicolas V. (1447-1455) to save Constantinople when Mahomet II. laid siege to it in April, 1453, was not more successful, for a fleet, to which the Pope contributed 18 galleys and 3,000 men, the King of Naples 20 galleys, the Venetians 25 galleys and the Genoese 7 transports, was still on its way when Constantinople fell on the 29th of May, and it was shortly after scattered by a storm.

The successor of Nicolas V., Calixtus III. (1455-1458), was even still more ardent in the cause of the defense of Christendom against Islam. When elected Pope he pronounced publicly in the Conclave a vow to make every effort to rescue Constantinople from the Turks, and to procure the necessary funds he sacrificed his private fortune as well as the treasure and the gold and silver plate left by his predecessor; even the clasps and the ornaments of precious metals on the richly bound volumes collected by Nicholas V. were torn off and sent to the Mint. Legates went forth from Rome to persuade the sovereigns of Europe to take part in the Crusade, and monks of various orders to excite the enthusiasm of the people; but the

Pope's efforts were in vain. In France the hundred years' war had just ended and the country was too exhausted and impoverished to undertake a distant expedition; in England the war of the Two Roses had just begun; in Germany the Emperor Frederic III. was engaged in continual struggles with his subjects, and the Venetians had made peace with the Turks, as war would have had an injurious effect on their commerce. Calixtus III. being, therefore, obliged to rely on his own resources, ordered the construction of a dockyard on the banks of the Tiber, sent for the most skillful workmen, and soon created a fleet of galleys and transports which he placed under the command of Cardinal Scarampo as his Legate and of a Portuguese officer named Velasco Farinha as vice admiral.

The treachery of Alfonso of Aragon, King of Naples, nearly caused the failure of the enterprise; for the King, who was at war with the Republic of Genoa, persuaded the leaders of another fleet which had been built in the Papal possessions at Avignon, to take part with his galleys in laying waste the territory of his enemies, and he was also suspected of instigating the chief of a band of mercenaries, named Giacompo Piccinino, to make a raid on the Papal States. The adventurer was repulsed and, in revenge, attempted to burn the galleys in the port of Cività Vecchia; but neither the indifference of the European powers nor the hostility of the King of Naples could turn the Sovereign Pontiff from his purpose, and, towards the end of June, 1456, Cardinal Scarampo set sail with 16 galleys and some transports carrying 1,000 sailors, 5,000 soldiers and 300 guns.

Almost simultaneously with the departure of this fleet took place the severe defeat inflicted on Mahomet II. by the Hungarians at the siege of Belgrade, a defeat which saved Europe from a Turkish invasion and which was in a great measure due to the efforts of the Papal Legate, Cardinal John Carvajal, and to the eloquence of St. John Capistrano, one of the missionaries who had been sent to preach the Crusade. They had found it impossible to prevail on the King of Hungary or the greater part of the Hungarian nobles to take up arms; they then turned to the people and raised an army of German and Hungarian peasants, which under the leadership of John Hunyady repelled the assaults of the Turks on the fortress and forced the Sultan's army to fly with the loss of its artillery and baggage.

The Papal fleet, commanded by Cardinal Scarampo, brought arms and provisions to the Knights of Rhodes and then cruised for nearly three years in the Ægean Sea, where it rescued over 100,000 Christian slaves and drove the Turks from several islands which were held by Papal garrisons as long as the expedition lasted. The Pope in the meanwhile built more galleys and sent them with troops

to the assistance of George Scanderbeg, Prince of Albania, which enabled him to win a victory over the Turks. No one, in fact, did more to check the victorious progress of Mahomet II. after the fall of Constantinople than Calixtus III., whose appeals for help met with no response from the sovereigns who owed the safety of their States to his foresight and determination.

It was also with the object of uniting all Christendom against the common enemy that Pius II. (1458-1464), the successor of Calixtus II., assembled at Mantua, after much opposition and long delays, a congress of envoys from all the States of Europe. The first sitting took place in September, 1459, but after wasting some months in useless discussions, the envoys departed without having come to any decision. War broke out soon after between the pretenders to the crown of Naples, and Mahomet II., taking advantage of these dissensions, conquered Bosnia and the island of Mitylene, and attacked the Venetian possessions in the Peloponesus.

Pius II. then resolved, in spite of his age and his infirmities, to place himself at the head of a Crusade, hoping, as he said, that his example might bring together volunteers and arouse the nations whose independence was menaced by the Turks. The Pope left Rome in June, 1464; he had reckoned on obtaining assistance from the Duke of Burgundy, who had made a vow to take part in a Crusade; from the Hungarians, who were alarmed by the conquest of Bosnia; from the Venetians, who saw their Greek territories in danger; and he had endeavored to induce the other Italian States to take up arms, though indeed without obtaining any other result than vague promises to furnish a few galleys. At the last moment, however, the Duke of Burgundy broke his vow by order of his feudal superior, Louis XI., King of France; the plague appeared at Venice and stopped all preparations, and Mathias Corvinus, King of Hungary, was alone determined to fight. On the other hand, large numbers of the peasantry and of the working classes from various countries flocked, as in the time of the Crusades, to take ship at Ancona, but there were no leaders to maintain discipline among these crowds, and, as the Holy Father was borne in his litter towards Ancona, he met numerous bands of recruits returning to their homes, wearied and discouraged. It was only on August 12, after a delay of nearly a month, that Christoforo Moro, the Doge of Venice, arrived with 12 galleys, but Pius II. died on August 15; the Cardinals who had accompanied the Holy Father returned immediately to Rome to hold the Conclave; the Doge, who was allowed to unite to his fleet the six galleys fitted out by the Pope, brought his ships back to Venice and the project of undertaking a Crusade was abandoned.

Paul II. (1464-1471) carried on no campaign against the Turks, though he assisted Matthias Corvinus, King of Hungary, and George Scanderbeg with large sums of money and made ceaseless endeavors to rouse the Italian States from their lethargy, but under his successor, Sixtus IV. (1471-1484), preparations for war were again set on foot. The dockyards of Rome and of Ancona were once more full of activity, and in May, 1472, Cardinal Oliviero Caraffa, as Papal Legate, set sail with 24 galleys and 6 transports carrying 4,700 soldiers. At Rhodes he was joined by 17 Neapolitan galleys and 46 from Venice, together with transports, but this large fleet, which carried over 15,000 soldiers, achieved no more important results than the destruction of the town of Adalia, on the southern coast of Asia Minor, and the plundering of Smyrna. During the following years the action of the Papal galleys was limited to guarding the coasts of Italy against pirates without attempting any more distant expedition, probably for want of allies; for, though the Sovereign Pontiff never ceased to call the attention of all Europe to the dangers with which it was menaced, his warnings met with no response; even the Venetians, in the interests of their commerce, made peace with the Sultan, who, encouraged by this indifference on the part of the Christian world, proceeded to make further conquests. In 1478 the Mahometans seized nearly all Albania; their attack on Rhodes in 1480 failed owing to the bravery of the knights, but, in the same year, they took Otranto, in the south of Italy, massacred a part of the inhabitants and carried the remainder away into captivity. They then held the town for several months, though blockaded by a large fleet and an army collected from all parts of Italy by the efforts of Sixtus IV., and the garrison capitulated only after the death of Mahomet II.

It was only with considerable difficulty and after urgent appeals that Innocent VIII. (1484-1492) and Alexander VI. (1492-1503) succeeded in convoking meetings of ambassadors from the European powers in 1490 and in 1500, with the hope of forming a league against the Turks, who still continued to advance their frontiers; but, after long deliberations, these conferences separated without coming to any practical conclusion, and no supplications or reproaches on the part of the Pope could prevail on the rulers of Christendom to lay aside their petty rivalries and combine for the defense of Europe against their common enemy. Even the Crusade which was preached by Papal Legates throughout Germany, France and England did not meet with much success. The two former countries contributed very little towards the expenses of a war in the East. Henry VII., of England, and the English clergy gave money, but the King refused to send either men or ships; Hun-

gary and Venice alone formed a league with the Pope and Spain was persuaded to assist with some galleys. The only result of the campaign which followed was the conquest of the islands of Caphalonia and Santa Maura, and the latter even was given up when the Venetians made peace with the Sultan in 1503.

But if this indifference or ill will on the part of the rulers of other States rendered it difficult for the Popes to undertake distant expeditions, they neglected no means of guarding the coasts of the Papal territory against the Barbary pirates, who in the sixteenth century were more formidable than ever, as they had become masters of Algiers, Tunis, Tripoli and Alexandria and held the rank of admirals in the Turkish fleet. A small squadron was therefore specially formed for this purpose by Innocent VIII. It consisted of four galleys, two with fifty oars, carrying besides the crew fifty soldiers and 150 rowers, and two thirty oars, carrying thirty soldiers and thirty rowers. For the maintenance of these galleys a duty of two per cent. was levied on all merchandise imported by sea, and from a contract made under Julius II. in 1511 between the Papal Treasury and a Genoese captain who owned these ships, we learn what were the duties of this officer. He was to protect the vessels and the goods of persons going to or from Rome, and to have as perquisites the ships and the property of the pirates whom he could seize; but he was bound to give compensation for the damages caused by pirates within his jurisdiction, unless he could prove that they were so superior in numbers that he could not have attacked them, and he was forbidden to use his galleys for the purpose of trade or to accept any gifts from the merchants to whom he rendered any service.

The limits of this article will not admit of a detailed account of the various engagements in which the Papal Navy played a distinguished part during the sixteenth century; it will suffice to mention the campaign of 1532, during the reign of Clement VII., when a contingent of 12 Papal galleys formed part of the fleet sent by the Emperor Charles V. and the Knights of Malta, under the command of Andrea Doria, a Genoese admiral in the Emperor's service, which took the Turkish fortress of Koron, in the south of the Morea; and the campaign of 1535, under the Pontificate of Paul III. (1534-1548). Twelve Papal galleys took part also in this expedition, led by the Emperor in person, when Tunis, the stronghold of the celebrated pirate Barbarossa, was taken and 10,000 Christian slaves set free.

It may seem hardly credible, but it has been very clearly demonstrated by Padre Guglielmotti that the Sovereign Pontiffs had frequently to struggle not only against the open hostility of the infidels, but also against the duplicity and treachery of their allies, and

especially of the Emperor Charles V. and of his son Philip II. of Spain. Though these monarchs seem to have been perfectly willing to destroy their neighbors, the Algerine pirates who devastated the coasts of Spain, yet whenever their fleets operated in the Eastern Mediterranean, where the Republic of Venice had large possessions, they appear to have instructed their admirals to avoid inflicting a too crushing defeat on the Turkish Empire, but to leave it strength enough to be still dangerous to the Venetians, and thus render the Republic incapable of resisting the ambitious designs of the Spanish monarchy on Italy.

The first manifestation of this policy took place when in 1538 a treaty was made between Paul III., Charles V. and the Venetians, by which these powers agreed to send against the Turks a fleet of 200 galleys, 36 of which should be furnished by the Papal Government and 82 by each of its allies, besides 100 transports provided by the Emperor. The supreme command of the expedition, which carried over 50,000 soldiers, was entrusted to Andrea Doria.

The Venetian contingent and 27 Papal galleys met at Corfu in June, ready to begin the campaign, but Andrea Doria did not appear until September, and then with only half the number of galleys promised. During this delay the Venetians had bombarded the fortress of Prevesa at the entrance to the neighboring Gulf of Arta, but the most favorable months for carrying on a naval campaign had elapsed; and this method of rendering an expedition useless for all practical purposes was adopted on many other occasions by the Spanish Government. More treachery was to follow. After the Venetian attack on Prevesa, Barbarossa had brought his fleet into the Gulf of Arta, and Doria, with the splendid force at his disposal, could have easily forced it to surrender, as the Venetians requested him to do, but he refused and decided to attack the town of Patras, in the Gulf of Lepanto. The allied fleet sailed, therefore, southwards past the mouth of the Gulf of Arta without seeking to bring on an engagement, and on the morning of the following day the Turkish fleet of 94 galleys was seen advancing in pursuit. Doria again wished to avoid fighting, but the Venetians insisted and the galleys formed in line, with the sailing vessels on their flanks. As the two fleets faced each other the wind fell, and though the galleys could have rowed forward and fought, Doria refused to give the signal for the attack, under the pretext that the sailing vessels would have been left behind. Towards evening the wind rose, and still no signal was given, but as the allied fleet drifted down towards the Turks Doria suddenly made his ships spread their sails, led them along with his galleys towards the west and fled to Corfu. The remainder of the allied fleet, left without orders or guidance, reluctantly fol-

lowed the admiral, and Barbarossa, bearing down upon them, soon changed their retreat into a flight. It is a remarkable fact that, in the midst of the outcry of indignation and contempt which arose on all sides against Doria, the Emperor Charles V. should have declared that he approved of his conduct.

As a consequence of this disgraceful defeat a fresh impulse was given to piracy, and Barbarossa, together with Dragut, one of his lieutenants, wrought such devastation on the coasts of Spain and Italy that the Emperor determined to lead an expedition against their chief stronghold, Algiers. Rome contributed seven galleys to the imperial fleet, but the troops had hardly landed on October 24, 1541, when a violent tempest, which destroyed many of the vessels, together with the supplies and the artillery, obliged the Emperor to abandon his project and reëmbark.

Barbarossa died in 1546, and though Andrea Doria expelled Dragut from Mehedia, on the coast of Tunis, the corsair established himself at Tripoli, and the war which broke out in 1555 between France and Spain, as well as that between Spain and Pope Paul IV., in the course of which the troops of Philip II., under the Duke of Alba, invaded the Papal States, enabled him to continue his piratical expeditions. He burned Reggio in Calabria, plundered Salerno and laid the country waste up to the environs of Naples, carrying away thousands of the inhabitants into slavery, and then ravaged the coasts of Spain and the island of Minorca. Pius IV. (1559-1565) could contribute only three galleys to the fleet which Philip II., in March, 1560, sent to attack Tripoli, in the hope of destroying the power of Dragut. The expedition took the island of Jerbah, situated between Tunis and Tripoli, but was then surprised by a Turkish fleet and defeated with great loss. Such was the consternation caused by this disaster that Pius IV. immediately took steps to strengthen the fortifications of Rome and laid the foundations of the line of bastions, which starts from the Castle of St. Angelo, encloses the walls built by St. Leo IV. round the Vatican and St. Peter's, and joins the Tiber at the Hospital of Sto. Spirito. It was also Pius IV. who began to construct the watch towers which guard the coasts of the Papal States, and, as a further measure of defense against the Turks, he organized in 1563 a militia or national guard in which all men capable of bearing arms were enrolled. This citizen army, which amounted to 70,000 infantry and 15,000 cavalry, was divided into companies of 250 men, who assembled in the nearest towns on every feast day for inspection and drill. Certain privileges, such as the right to wear swords and the exemption from some taxes, were enjoyed by those who served in these troops, which were disbanded at the dawn of the French Revolution.

The Papal galleys had perished in the combat at Jerbah, so that when St. Pius V. (1566-1572) wished to assist the Republic of Venice to defend its possessions in the island of Cyprus, which were attacked by Sultan Selim II., he was obliged to purchase twelve empty galleys from the Venetians and equip and arm them at Ancona. Marcantonio Colona, Duke of Paliano, was named captain general of this fleet, and after waiting long at Otranto, he was joined by a Spanish contingent under Gian Andrea Doria, a relation of Andrea Doria. The Venetian vessels were already at Suda Bay, in the island of Crete, and when the Papal and Spanish galleys reached them the departure of the expedition was again so long delayed by the various objections raised by Doria, that while it was on its way it received the news that Nicosia, the capital of Cyprus, had been stormed by the Turks after a desperate resistance; that 40,000 persons had been massacred and 15,000 carried away as slaves. The combined fleets immediately returned to Crete, where they separated, and many galleys perished in a storm while on their way home.

In the meanwhile, the Holy Father, like so many of his predecessors, had sought to persuade the sovereigns of the various States of Europe to form an alliance against the Turks, but only Venice and Spain sent ambassadors to the conference which met in Rome in July, 1570. It soon became evident that the Spanish Government had not a sincere desire to crush the power of the Sultan, for the opposition made by its envoys to every proposal caused the negotiations to last until March, 1571, when a league against the Turks was at last concluded between the Holy See, the King of Spain and the Republic of Venice, by which the allies bound themselves to maintain a fleet of 200 galleys and 100 ships, which were to be in readiness every year at the end of March. The contribution of the Papal Government was fixed at 12 galleys and one-sixth of the expenses. Each power was to name a general, the decision of any two of whom was to be final, and the rank of captain general was assigned to Don Juan of Austria. Before these articles were signed a last attempt was made by the Spanish envoys, to the great indignation of the Holy Father, to defer their execution till the following year, under the pretext that so large a fleet could not be got ready in time, and that that year the allies could only stand on the defensive. This unexpected objection caused the Venetians to despair of saving their possessions which were being devastated by the Turks, while the enormous expense of the fleet was impoverishing the Republic, and they were on the point of coming to terms with the Sultan, had not Marcantonio Colonna, whom the Pope sent to them as ambassador, prevailed on them to adhere to the agreement.

The league was at last solemnly ratified at a Consistory held in

Rome on May 23, 1571, and on June 20 the twelve galleys which the Holy See had hired from the Grand Duke of Tuscany were the first to appear at Messina, where the allies were to assemble. The Venetian fleet arrived three days later, but Don Juan of Austria did not appear with that of Spain, which was mostly composed of contingents from various Italian States, until August 23, and during this delay the Turks had without hindrance laid waste the Venetian territories on the coasts of the Adriatic almost as far as Venice. The Prince was accompanied by a council of five persons named by Philip II., who were to watch over his actions and restrain his impetuosity, and his arrival did not hasten the opening of the campaign, as the Spanish captains showed great repugnance to engage the Ottoman fleet and would have preferred to attack Tunis. Nevertheless, the opinions of Marcantonio Colonna and of Sebastiano Veniero, the admirals of the Roman and of the Venetian fleets, prevailed over these timid counsels, and on September 16 the Prince sailed at last from Messina.

Before relating the naval combat which took place at Lepanto, where the Turkish Empire met with the most serious reverse it had ever experienced at sea, it may, perhaps, be interesting to describe the galleys which at that epoch and even down to nearly the end of the eighteenth century constituted the greater portion of the military navy of the States of Southern Europe. They were long narrow vessels, about 164 feet in length and 22 in width, of very light draught and low free-board, and carried two masts with triangular sails. At the prow was placed a platform called *la rembata*, on which musketeers and armed sailors were posted during an engagement, and from beneath which projected the mouths of five guns throwing balls of 50, 24 and 12 pounds. The poop where the officers stood was raised above the rest of the galley, and a part of it was covered with an awning, which, in the admiral's galley, was of red damask with golden fringes and tassels. A gangway called *la corsia* ran the entire length of the ship; it was the post of the *comito*, who commanded the rowers, and on each side were 25 benches about 10 feet long and a little over 4 feet apart, to which they were chained, to the number, generally, of five to each bench. A cushion made of sacking stuffed with wool, over which was thrown a piece of leather, served to attenuate somewhat the violence of the shock when the slaves fell back on their benches while pulling the oar. At a distance of four feet from the side of the galley ran a beam called *il posticcio*, which was supported by projecting brackets and carried the rowlocks. The ponderous oar was from 30 to 40 feet long, and being too massive to be grasped by the hand, it was worked by means of handles attached to the upper part, which was

also weighted with lead in order to counterbalance the portion extending beyond the galley. Such was the craft which, with slight modifications, was the line of battleship of the Mediterranean States from the Middle Ages down to comparatively recent times and which was only slowly abandoned when the increased size of naval guns rendered it necessary to employ larger and more strongly built vessels.

The fleet advanced slowly round the south of Italy to a port on the coast of Epirus, but during the time which had been wasted by the unreadiness of the Spaniards, Famagousta, the last Venetian stronghold in the island of Cyprus, had fallen. The garrison, consisting chiefly of soldiers from the Papal States in the pay of Venice, had resisted bravely for several months until compelled by hunger to capitulate on favorable terms; but, on the following day, Mustafa, the Turkish general, had caused the principal officers to be put to death, and the Venetian commander, Marcantonio Bragadino, to be flayed alive.

The fleet moved forward again; the Spanish counsellors again sought to dissuade Don Juan from fighting, but the Prince remained firm in his decision, for which he was afterwards severely blamed by the Spanish Court, and as, on the morning of the 7th of October the galleys sailed out of the strait between the islands of Cephalaria and Ithaca towards the Gulf of Lepanto, the Turkish fleet was seen advancing to meet it. The two forces then in presence were the most powerful which had ever met during the long series of wars between Christendom and Islam. On the side of the allies there were 207 galleys, 6 galleasses or large three-masted galleys and 30 transports carrying 1,815 guns, 28,000 soldiers, chiefly Italian, 12,920 sailors and 43,500 rowers; while the Turks had 222 galleys, and 60 galliots or smaller galleys, carrying 750 guns; the soldiers numbered 34,000, the sailors 13,000 and the rowers 41,000. The Christian fleet formed with its three divisions, in which the galleys of the different States had been indiscriminately mingled, a line of three miles in length. The left wing, comprising 55 galleys, flying yellow flags, was commanded by Agostino Barberino, of Venice. Sixty-one galleys, carrying blue flags, formed the centre, led by the *Reale*, or Royal galley of Spain, and by those of the Spaniards of the different contingents; and the 53 galleys of the right wing, which bore green flags were led by Gian Andrea Doria, who, in order not to be surrounded, placed his division far out to sea and thus left the centre unprotected. A reserve of 30 galleys under the Marquis of Santa Cruz was stationed about a mile to the rear; some smaller galleys served as guards to the admirals, and the six unwieldy Venetian galleasses were towed to a position some distance in front of the line.

The Turkish fleet was also divided into three squadrons. The 95 galleys of the centre were commanded by the Ottoman admiral, Ali Pacha, the brother-in-law of Sultan Selim; the right wing of 53 galleys by Mahomet Schoulak, Viceroy of Egypt; the 65 galleys of the left wing by Uluch Ali Dey, of Algiers, and 10 galleys with 60 smaller vessels formed the rear-guard.

As the Turkish fleet drew near, its admiral fired a gun by way of challenge, to which Don Juan immediately replied; the standard of the league, which had been blessed by St. Pius V., a crimson banner bearing the image of the Crucifix, was hoisted at the mast of the *Reale*, and at the sight all on board the fleet knelt to receive absolution from the priests who were on each galley.

The advance of the Turkish fleet was for a while checked, and its squadrons thrown into disorder by the fire of the heavy guns of the galleasses, but these were soon left behind and the two lines met. On the left the Viceroy of Egypt sought to pass between the Venetians and the land, and succeeded in destroying eight galleys, but was repelled by the bravery of Barberino, who, though mortally wounded, still continued to command. The Venetians then rallied and attacked in their turn. Mahomet Schoulak was killed and his galley sunk; his followers, discouraged by his loss, ran their vessels ashore in attempting to escape, and Barberino survived his wound long enough to learn the defeat of the enemy.

The most desperate fighting took place in the centre of the line, where the galleys of the two commanders came into collision. They were speedily reënforced by others, and the victory remained long undecided until the Turkish admiral's galley was boarded for the third time, when Ali Pacha was killed, the Ottoman standard was lowered, and most of the remaining vessels surrendered. It was on the right of the allied fleets that their chief losses were sustained. Doria had placed his squadron so far from the position assigned to him that Padre Guglielmotti accuses him of a desire to avoid fighting; and when Uluch Ali perceived that several galleys on the right of the central division had become too much detached from it, while trying to fill up the space left vacant by Doria, he fell upon them with such impetuosity that he took twelve, among which was the chief galley of the Knights of Malta. Reënforcements, however, speedily came up, Uluch Ali was obliged to abandon, not only his prizes, but also many of his own vessels, and when he saw that his admiral was defeated, he gave the signal for retreat, and passing through the opening which should have been held by Doria's squadron he fled with forty galleys back to Constantinople. The rest of the Turkish fleet was sunk or taken, about 30,000 of their soldiers and sailors were killed, 3,000 were made prisoners and

12,000 Christian slaves released from their chains. The loss of the allies was about 15,000 killed and wounded. At a council of war held on the following day, it was decided, in spite of the advice of Marcantonio Colonna, not to follow up the victory, but to return to winter quarters, thus ending prematurely a campaign from which, however, may be dated the beginning of the decline of the Turkish Empire.

The campaign of the following year, 1572, afforded a fresh proof of the duplicity of Philip II., for, when Marcantonio Colonna, who had been confirmed in his command by Gregory XIII. (1572-1585), the successor of St. Pius V., joined the Venetian and Spanish fleets at Messina in the month of June, with thirteen Papal galleys, he found that Don Juan had received orders not to leave that port. It was only after long negotiations that Don Juan, whom, on this occasion, the King had provided with a council of twenty persons, was allowed to lend twenty-two galleys to his allies, who left at once, and in the middle of July reached Corfú, where the rest of the Venetian fleet had been in readiness since the beginning of April. Colonna and the Venetians then went in search of the Turkish fleet of 200 vessels, which, by very great efforts, the Sultan had succeeded in assembling, but Uluch Ali, who was in command, not trusting his inexperienced crews, preferred to fly before the allied admirals rather than risk an engagement. While the Papal Venetian galleys were pursuing the Turks, and seeking to force them to fight, they were recalled to Corfú by Don Juan, who had at last arrived at that port, and there took the command of the united fleets; but it was only on September 11 that, after still further delays, he went in search of the Turks. The Mahometan fleet had taken refuge in the ports of Navarino and Modon, and Colonna and the Venetians hoped to surprise the two squadrons and destroy them before they could effect a junction. But during the night of September 17 the pilot of Don Juan's galley which guided the allied fleet steered it several miles out of its course to the north of Navarino instead of to the south between that port and Modon, thus allowing the Turks to escape from their dangerous position and concentrate their fleet under the protection of the guns of Modon, and losing the opportunity of ending the war by a single blow. It was in vain that Colonna showed that it would still be possible to storm the fortress and seize the fleet; even the Venetians were discouraged and refused to carry out his plans; and after more time had been wasted in useless discussions and a feeble attempt had been made to take a small fort in Navarino Bay, the fleets separated and returned home. The most important result of the campaign was that although it had been the intention of the allies to continue the war, yet the Venetians, considering how

much they had been obstructed and betrayed by the perfidious policy of the King of Spain, preferred to make peace with the Sultan even on very onerous conditions, and the league of the three Powers was dissolved.

The league was never renewed, but, though the Papal Government was unable when abandoned to its own resources to undertake any distant expedition, it still continued to maintain a small fleet and to guard the coasts of its territory from the corsairs of Algiers and Tunis. This fleet was raised to ten galleys by Sixtus V. (1585-1590), who assigned an annual sum of 102,500 crowns for its maintenance, and named a commission of five Cardinals to watch over its discipline and management.

Clement VIII. (1592-1600) sought to form an alliance with Spain with a view to undertaking a campaign against the Turks, but Philip II. refused; he consented, however, to allow the Papal galleys to join his fleet at Messina, but, as on former occasions, though the Roman contingent appeared at the appointed place of meeting in April, that of Spain under Gian Andrea Doria did not arrive until it was too late to enter upon a campaign, and, in the meanwhile, a powerful Turkish fleet had devastated the coasts of Campania and burned the town of Reggio.

At the beginning of the seventeenth century, under Paul V. (1605-1621), a change took place in the organization of the Papal navy, which thenceforth, with the exception of a few intervals, was maintained by contractors who undertook, in return for a stipulated sum (generally about 80,000 crowns), to maintain in good order three galleys and four small ships. They were also allowed in time of peace to carry merchandise, which had been previously forbidden, and were granted a quarter of the value of the prizes they might take from pirates.

Padre Guglielmotti enters into very full details with regard to the war of Crete, in which the Papal fleet, combined with those of Venice and Malta, played a distinguished part. In this succession of campaigns, which lasted from 1643 to 1669, the Dardanelles were blockaded and a Turkish convoy destroyed in 1657; the Turkish fleets were frequently beaten and driven from the sea; but it was not found possible to raise the siege of Candia, even with the help of an expedition of 8,000 men sent by Louis XIV. After a gallant defense of many years, the town capitulated, and the island of Crete was lost by the Venetians. More success attended the war for the reconquest of the Morea when Poland and Austria joined the alliance in 1684. The Turkish seaports and fortress yielded to the fleets of Rome, Venice and Malta, led by the Venetian admiral, Francesco Morosini, and in 1699 the Sultan, Mustapha II., signed a peace at Carlowitz, by

which he gave up to the Emperor, to Poland and to Venice the territories which they had acquired.

Though the Ottoman Government was at peace with the rest of Europe, the semi-independent Mahometan States of North Africa still continued to send out corsairs, and to guard against them the Papal galleys, usually commanded by Knights of the Order of Malta, sailed every spring from Cività Vecchia to cruise in the Mediterranean till October. Their duties were rendered more arduous by the treaty concluded between France and the Barbary States about 1738, which allowed the corsairs to take refuge in the ports of Provence on condition of not attacking any merchant vessel within thirty miles of the coast; and in 1749 the Grand Duke of Tuscany disarmed his few galleys and gave to the Powers free access to the harbors of his States. About the same time the pirates began to replace their galleys by sailing vessels which could carry heavier guns and remain at sea during the winter, and this innovation rendered necessary a similar change in the Papal navy. Two small frigates of thirty guns were, therefore, purchased in England in 1755 under the reign of Benedict XIV. (1740-1750) for £4,700 each, and named San Pietro and San Paolo, which were replaced in 1762 by two others of thirty-two guns, built in Cività Vecchia, and named San Clemente and San Carlo. Such was, then, the reputation of the Papal navy for efficiency and discipline, that when in 1764 Carlo Emmanuele III., King of Sardinia, wished to equip vessels for the protection of his territories, he applied to Rome for information with regard to the organization and regulations of the Papal fleet.

In the latter part of the eighteenth century the Barbary corsairs still continued to make their piratical expeditions, but more rarely and no longer on the same formidable scale as in the past, and further changes were therefore made in the composition of the Papal navy. In 1793 the three galleys were still maintained and they were manned by 218 officers and sailors and 183 soldiers, but the frigates had been replaced by two corvettes of twenty guns with crews of 145 men each. There were also four launches, each carrying a twenty-four-pounder and twelve smaller pieces; eight gunboats with a twelve-pounder each and six smaller guns, and a mortar vessel. The crews of these thirteen boats amounted to 256 men. Another modification took place in 1796, when the three galleys were set aside and replaced by two *mezzo galere* or half galleys rowed by forty sailors instead of by convicts, carrying one twenty-four-pounder, two twelve-pounders and eight smaller guns, and manned by two hundred sailors and fifty soldiers.

Such was the Papal navy when the troops of the French Republic after conquering Lombardy invaded the States of the Church with-

out declaration of war. By the treaty of Tolentino (19th February, 1797) the Holy See was deprived of Avignon, of the Legations of Bologna, Ferrara and Romagna; and on February 10, 1798, under pretext of avenging the death of General Duphot, who was shot during a popular tumult in Rome, General Berthier occupied the Eternal City.

A few days later the Republic was proclaimed, and by order of the French Directory, Pius VI. was carried away a prisoner into Tuscany, leaving all the possessions of the Church in the hands of the French.

The invasion of Egypt took place shortly afterwards, and when Bonaparte left Toulon in the month of May with the main body of the expedition, all the merchant vessels in the port of Cività Vecchia were seized for the purpose of transporting General Desaix and five regiments of the army of Italy to Alexandria. The Papal *mezze galere*, the eight gunboats and two of the launches, along with their crews were forced to serve as escort, and the French also took with them the Arabic types belonging to the College of the Propaganda.

After the taking of Alexandria by the French; the twelve Roman boats acted as guard to the flotilla of seventy-two small vessels laden with stores and ammunition which ascended the Nile to Cairo, and, together with the troops which had marched across the desert, they inflicted a severe defeat on the Mameluke Beys at the village of Shebrahet. A few days later they again took an important share in the attack on Embabeh, a combat which is better known as the battle of the Pyramids, where they destroyed a much more numerous Turkish flotilla of corvettes and gunboats. The *mezze galere* and some other boats of the Papal navy formed also part of the expedition led by General Desaix into Upper Egypt as far as the first cataract, defeated the Mamelukes in two engagements and took what remained of their vessels. The *mezze galere* then descended the Nile to be placed as guard ships at Damietta and Ghizeh, and they probably fell into the hands of the English by the capitulations of Cairo and Alexandria. The rest of the flotilla was surprised on the Upper Nile by the Mamelukes; its chief officer blew up his boat rather than surrender, and nothing is known of the fate of the others, but none of the vessels were taken away from Cività Vecchia and only very few of the sailors ever returned.

The Papal navy was never reëstablished on the same footing as in the days when in alliance with Spain and Venice it fought against the Mahometan fleets. In 1804 Bonaparte, when First Consul, gave Pius VII. two brigantines of sixteen guns, which took some corsairs; but the conquest of Algiers by France in 1830 put an end forever to the piracy which for so many centuries had devastated

the shores of the Mediterranean and rendered necessary the existence of a protecting force.

During the reign of Pius IX, the Papal Government still maintained as coast guards in the Mediterranean and the Adriatic four small gunboats and a corvette named *l'Immacolata Concezione*, which had been built in London in 1859. When Rome fell at last into the power of the Italian Government in 1870, Pius IX. presented the corvette to the French fathers of the order of St. Dominic, who employed it as a training ship at the Naval School of St. Elmo, which they had founded at Arcachon, in the department of La Gironde, under the direction of a member of the order who had been a naval officer. At his death, some ten or fifteen years ago, the corvette was sold, and the school was closed this year. Thus has disappeared the last representative of a navy which carried the standard of the Church for a thousand years, and which, in spite of the indifference, the hostility and even the treachery of the other European Powers, ever performed its duty undauntedly in the long and, as yet, unended struggle between Christendom and Islam.

DONAT SAMPSON.

London, England.

HEGEL AND THE SCHOOLMEN.

THERE are probably many readers of the present day who pay but little heed to the contending claims of rival schools of philosophy. To some the contest may well seem to be an empty war of words, without life or reality or prospect of definite issue. And they turn their attention to historical studies, or Biblical Criticism, or scientific research; or to the practical problems of politics and sociology. It may be allowed that, for the present at least, these matters are really of deeper moment than any abstract questions of metaphysics. Yet it is surely a grave mistake to treat the claims of philosophy too lightly, or to regard the interest which it formerly excited as an idle waste of intellectual energy. For, after all, these neglected problems of metaphysics lie at the roots of all the others. And the ideas of philosophers have more to do with scientific and social progress than superficial observers are apt to imagine. The apparently idle disputes of Nominalists and Realists, in the twelfth century, issued in a deep broad stream of thought that fertilized the whole field of mediæval life, and produced abundant fruit in its religion, its art and literature, and its social

system. The new ideas of the philosophers of the Renaissance wrought a far-reaching change in the whole fabric of Western Europe. The dreams of Rousseau were working in the great French Revolution. And in later days, the home of modern philosophy, the land of Kant and Fichte, of Schelling and Hegel, became the predominant power in politics, the temple of art and literature and the chief centre of historical science and Biblical Criticism.

For this reason it would be well if Catholics who rightly take a keen interest in the Biblical Question and the Social Question were equally alive to the importance of the issue involved in the question of philosophy. By this we do not mean any of the nice details of domestic controversy among our scholastics, or the old-time rivalry of Nominalists and Realists, Thomists and Scotists. These things still have their interest. But the crucial question is something broader and deeper. It is concerned with the whole state of Catholic philosophy and its relations with the wider world of modern thought. In a word, is Scholasticism adequate for the intellectual needs of the hour? Must it be, sooner or later, superseded by some modern system? Or is there not, to say the least, some room for improvement, for new methods and broader views and a more intelligent appreciation of modern philosophers?

This question was raised in the course of a recent controversy in England, and answered from their very different standpoints, but in a like uncompromising fashion, by liberal Catholic writers and by professors of scholastic philosophy. Thus, on the one side, we find that brilliant and incisive critic, Mr. Robert E. Dell, putting aside the scholastic method as hopelessly outworn and obsolete. To quote his own words on this topic, "The weapons with which the heroes of old won their philosophical victories are indeed ornaments to the Church, but their proper place nowadays is in a museum; to put them in an armoury for use is about as sensible as it would be to arm a modern soldier with a suit of chain armour and a cross-bow."¹

As an example of the opposite extreme, we may take the words in which a distinguished scholastic professor repudiates the suggestion that the philosophy of our schools ought to assimilate the teaching of modern thinkers.

"It would probably be as hard to transmute into true philosophy the errors that have flourished from the time of Locke to that of Schopenhauer as for a wren to digest a church steeple. Had St. Thomas, we are told, been living to-day, he would in this nineteenth century have yoked Hegel to his car, just as in the thirteenth he

¹ *Nineteenth Century*, April, 1900, p. 675.

yoked Aristotle. But I have never met with any proof of that assumption or with any suggestion as to how the said yoking is to be performed. You cannot couple together light and darkness, truth and error. Between Aristotle and Hegel there is a wide difference. The former was radically right; the latter is hopelessly wrong."²

There is certainly a sharp contrast between the views of these two able writers. Yet they have, withal, some common characteristics. Both alike show the same confidence in their own cause, and the same contempt for the other philosophy. And in this they may be taken as typical of the attitude adopted by many other champions of advanced views and professors of orthodox Scholasticism. Mr. Dell, we fancy, is by no means alone in wishing to banish scholastic philosophy to the seclusion of a museum; while other reformers would possibly be more contemptuous, and cast aside the old weapons as mere worthless lumber. And on the other hand, Father Coupe is by no means taking up a new position when he dismisses Hegel as "hopelessly wrong," and scouts the suggestion that we ought to assimilate the teaching of modern philosophers. The same view of the matter, if not in the same forcible and picturesque language, may be seen in any of our philosophic textbooks, where the systems of Kant and Fichte, and Schelling and Hegel are briefly set forth and formally refuted as false and absurd. The refutation probably appears effective enough to the ingenuous schoolboys for whose edification the books are intended—at any rate, it had this appearance to a certain simple student a quarter of a century ago. But this summary treatment of the German masters may well produce a very different impression on those who are familiar with their writings, or on converts who have studied philosophy at the feet of English Hegelians. In the latter case, the most likely result is a feeling of contempt for the methods of modern Scholasticism. And we fancy that this may be the origin of some recent exhibitions of hostility. But on this point the present writer cannot speak from his own experience; according to the straitest of their sects he was bred a scholastic.

It is not the purpose of the present paper to pursue the well-worn controversy on the rival merits of the old and new philosophies. There are many grave reasons that might be urged on either side of the question. Much that has been said by recent writers offers a tempting subject of criticism. And it would be an easy task to carry on the fray in the old familiar fashion, to make a fresh flourish

² See an article on Catholic Philosophy by Father Charles Coupe, S. J., in the *Tablet*, November 24, 1900. The writer is summarizing some of his own remarks in a lecture delivered to the students at Oscott.

of the commonplace arguments in favor of life and progress or orthodox conservatism; to cast ridicule on the continued use of musty mediæval methods, or to inveigh against the rash introduction of dangerous innovations. But there is no lack of advocates on either side, and it would be somewhat superfluous to add to their number and say over again what has been so ably said by others. There may, however, be some advantage in attempting to regard the whole matter in a different aspect, which has hitherto received but little attention. Much has been heard from the stalwart champions of Scholasticism who would reject all the modern systems, root and branch. And on the other hand, the zealous advocates of the new philosophies have been loud in their scorn of the schoolmen. In the heat of the fray it is likely enough that neither side has done full justice to the views of its opponents. And it is high time that the question was surveyed from the more impartial standpoint of students who can find much to admire both in the mediæval schoolmen and in the great thinkers of modern Germany.

To some it may seem idle to intervene in the discussion with this pacific purpose. We may be told once more that we cannot reconcile truth with error, or light with darkness, or make a Mezentian union of the dead and the living. But we have no wish to deny or to explain away the real and deep differences which divide the old and the new philosophies. We would not seek to make scholastics of Kant and Hegel; or to recast St. Thomas in a German mould; or to blend their teaching in some new and marvelous system,

"ein Zwitter, ein Mittelding,
Das weder Fleisch noch Fisch ist,
Das von den Extremen unserer Zeit
Ein närrisches Gemisch ist."

Happily we are engaged on a more modest, and at the same time, a more hopeful enterprise. We would fain endeavor to see both the mediæval and the modern philosophies as they really are in themselves, not as they appear when seen through the distorting medium of unsympathetic or hostile criticism. From this standpoint we may be able to make some profitable comparison, to note any points of resemblance or analogy, and maybe to find that, even where they differ, each may in some measure be illustrated by the other. Much of what has been said so far will obviously apply to the comparison of any modern philosophy with the scholastic system. But in the present study we may confine our attention to Hegel, partly indeed from personal preference for that philosopher, but chiefly because his ideas have a far-reaching influence in modern English thought, while on the other hand he has probably suffered more than any of his compeers at the rude hands of controversial opponents.

We are not now concerned with the bold suggestion that the scholastic system should be abandoned and some new philosophy set in its place; nor need we dwell on the uncompromising answer of the orthodox champions. But we may venture to remark that the alternative is sometimes presented in a manner that is a little **misleading**. After all, it is not a simple question of yea and nay; or a choice between two abstract propositions, of which it can be said that the one is false and the other true. To listen to some controversialists, we might suppose that the scholastic philosophy was something simple, uniform and indivisible, which is to be received in its entirety or rejected altogether. Yet, when once we turn from the trivial text-books of to-day to the large and varied literature left by the mediæval masters, we can readily see that neither course is possible. In that wide mass of doctrines, principles, profound speculation, subtle distinctions and fleeting, often conflicting, opinions, that makes up the philosophy of the schoolmen, there is much that their most loyal and conservative disciple must fain relinquish; and much that must needs be accepted by the most progressive of modern thinkers.

In spite of all the safeguards provided by its vaunted logical methods, it must be confessed that mediæval philosophy was often disturbed by the presence of dangerous doctrines, and opinions as strange and fantastic as any of the dreams of later ages. And, in spite of all that is said in its disparagement, it has left a goodly legacy to modern philosophers. But, unfortunately, too many modern readers know nothing of the debt which their new masters owe to the despised mediæval schoolmen. For many seem to suppose that the philosophy of these last centuries began afresh with Descartes, or Locke, or Bacon. Most modern students are aware that Kant is under some obligations to Hume and Berkeley. But how many of them know that Hume owed something to the teaching of St. Thomas? Coleridge tells us that his friends were incredulous when he first suggested that the Scottish skeptic had borrowed anything from the Angelic Doctor. But the justice of his surmise was fortunately confirmed by satisfactory evidence.

As the *Biographia Literaria*, though known to lovers of literature, may not be equally familiar to students of philosophy, it may be well to cite the poet's words on this matter.

"In consulting the excellent commentary of St. Thomas Aquinas on the *Parva Naturalia* of Aristotle, I was struck at once with its close resemblance to Hume's essay on association. The main thoughts were the same in both, the *order* of the thoughts was the same, and even the illustrations differed only by Hume's occasional substitution of more modern examples. I mentioned the circum-

stance to several of my literary acquaintances, who admitted the closeness of the resemblance, and that it seemed too great to be explained by mere coincidence; but they thought it improbable that Hume should have held the pages of the Angelic Doctor worth turning over. But some time after Mr. Payne, of the King's mews, shewed Sir James Mackintosh some odd volumes of St. Thomas Aquinas, partly perhaps from having heard that Sir James (then Mr.) Mackintosh had in his lectures past a high encomium on this canonized philosopher; but chiefly from the fact that the volumes had belonged to Mr. Hume, and had here and there marginal marks and notes of reference in his own hand writing. Among these volumes was that which contains the *Parva Naturalia*, in the old latin version, swathed and swaddled in the commentary afore mentioned!"³

It is clear that the scholastic philosophy cannot be accepted in its entirety or rejected as worthless. Nor is it otherwise with the philosophy of Hegel. Of course if it were only a question of the abstract and mysterious system set forth and refuted in our textbooks, the rejection *in toto* might be a comparatively simple matter, at least so far as the reader can attach any intelligible meaning to these cryptic utterances. But it is a very different thing when we turn to consider the voluminous writings of that vigorous and original thinker, who like the great schoolmen of old had fairly grappled with the multitudinous problems of the whole world of thought and being. It may well be doubted whether his most loyal and devoted disciple would be likely to accept the whole of Hegel's teaching without reserve or misgiving. And on the other hand, we make bold to say that no candid and unprejudiced student of the German philosopher would reject the whole as false or worthless.

In this way, it will be seen at once that a wider acquaintance with the literature of mediæval and modern philosophy does something to lessen the difference by which they are divided. Were it only for this reason, it is much to be wished that a knowledge of this kind could be made an indispensable condition in all those who would discuss the merits of the rival philosophies. It certainly does not seem too much to ask that critics should have an accurate and intimate acquaintance with the writers or systems on which they venture to pass judgment. Yet we fear that this reasonable requirement is not always fulfilled. Father Coupe tells us that he has never met a scholar holding advanced views on the subject of Scholasticism who was at the same time qualified by training to give a trustworthy opinion. And, on the other hand, the language held by

³ Coleridge's "Biographia Literaria," chapter v., pp. 104-5.

some Catholic critics of Kant or Hegel suggests a shrewd suspicion that the writer's acquaintance with the German philosophers is neither wide nor accurate. Yet here, if anywhere, there is need of an intimate knowledge of the original authorities. It is, we hope, no disparagement to the many excellent modern manuals of scholastic philosophy to say that however useful as an introduction to the subject, they are but a poor substitute for reading the mediæval masters in their native folios. And though Mr. Lang tells us that Hegel "mostly at second-hand" is a paying commodity in Oxford examinations, something more than this is needed to enable us to pass judgment on the German philosopher.

Wer den Dichter will verstehen,
Muss in Dichter's Lande gehen."

We may remark in passing that this same superficial and second-hand knowledge is, if we are not much mistaken, one of the foremost dangers of the present day. With the great increase of periodical literature, and the multiplication of popular primers and books of reference, it is open to every sciolist to lay down the law on matters of which he has little real knowledge, and pass judgment on authors whose writings he has never read. It is indeed possible to read without understanding, and prejudice may sometimes produce the same effects as ignorance. But if we could once get well rid of the superficial writers who speak without direct knowledge of the original authorities, the world would be delivered from a flood of captious controversy and unintelligent criticism.

Apart from this consideration, there is a further advantage in betaking ourselves to the pages of the great masters themselves. For, as Warburton has well said, they are frequently free from the party violence that is conspicuous in many of their followers. And certainly it is a relief to turn from the sharp censures of some of Hegel's admirers to see how Hegel himself has treated the despised mediæval schoolmen.

In some respects the most striking feature in his writings is the manner in which he has grasped and set forth the real unity of all history and all philosophy. In his view of the matter no philosophy is simply false or worthless. All the varied and interminable systems are but so many links in one long living chain, or stages in the gradual growth and evolution of human thought and history. To some it may seem that this is his own chief contribution to philosophic thought, and by this, rather than by his distinctive system, his name is likely to live in the literature of philosophy. The word evolution has become somewhat hackneyed of late. Yet few we fancy will dispute the profound importance of this idea, which has, we may say, dominated the world of science in Darwin's "Origin of

Species," and the world of theology in Newman's "Development of Doctrine." The significant resemblance of these two epoch-making books has often been remarked. And Mr. Spencer Jones has lately pointed out some curious coincidences in the gradual growth of the same leading idea in the minds of the man of science and the theologian. But without in any way disputing the originality of the work done by the two great English writers, we may observe that the German philosopher was in the field before them. Needless to say, there are some important differences in the mode of the idea and its method of treatment, as there are differences between the conception of Newman and that of Darwin. But the same great principle of development or evolution is plainly seen in Hegel's chief writings, notably in the "Philosophie der Geschichte" and the "Geschichte der Philosophie." In some respects the last named work has been surpassed by more recent histories of philosophy. But it was surely no mean service to this study to present the apparently aimless succession of conflicting systems as the working out of an ordered process.

This principle which recognizes the importance of all the philosophers of the past—whose thoughts as Hegel finely says are still as living and present as at the day of their birth—cannot but apply to the mediæval schoolmen. And accordingly we find that he pays some attention to their writings when he comes to treat of this period of philosophic history. The respect with which he speaks of St. Thomas and Scotus and the other mediæval masters is a pleasing contrast to the contempt displayed by some of their modern critics. Thus he sees that the *Summa*, with its formal logic, is yet free from idle subtleties, and is full of deep speculative thoughts on the whole field of theology and philosophy.⁴ He frankly recognizes that the scholastic Latin of Scotus, in spite of its barbarism, is admirably adapted for the purposes of philosophy.⁵ And looking at its deep speculative character, he sets the mediæval theology higher than that of modern days. The Catholics, he says bluntly, were never such barbarians as to think that eternal truth could not be known and grasped philosophically.⁶

⁴ "Es finden sich in diesem Buch zwar logische Förmlichkeiten, aber nicht dialektische Spitzfindigkeiten, sondern gründliche metaphysische (speculative) Geoanken, über den ganzen Umfang der Theologie und Philosophie." Hegel's Werke, Vol. XV., pp. 173-4.

⁵ "Das Latein ist sehr barbarisch, aber zur philosophischen Bestimmtheit gut geeignet." Ibid., p. 176.

⁶ "Die Theologie des Mittelalters steht so viel höher, als die der Neuere Zeit. Nie sind Katholiken solche Barbaren gewesen, dass über die ewige Wahrheit nicht erkannt, sie nicht philosophisch gefasst werden sollte." Ibid., p. 169. Cf. Vol. XIII., p. 97. "Die Scholastiker waren nicht solche Supranaturalisten: sie haben denkend, begreifend das Dogma der Kirche erkannt."

At the same time, it must be confessed that Hegel's account of the schoolmen and their writings can scarcely satisfy those who have made more extensive studies in this branch of philosophical literature. For, with all his keen insight and speculative powers, the German thinker was wanting in some of the qualifications needed by the literary historian. And his "*Geschichte der Philosophie*," whatever may be its merits in other respects, is marred by a strange inequality and lack of proportion. In some parts the author, carried away by some sympathy with his subject, is too copious and discursive, *e. g.*, when he is dealing with that singular philosopher, Jakob Böhme. Elsewhere, on the other hand, his notices are meagre and disappointing, while his information does not appear to be directly drawn from the original sources. And such is too commonly the case when he is dealing with the scholastic writers. It need hardly be added that his imperfect acquaintance with their works affects his general estimate of the philosophy of this important period.

Here, however, we must make an exception in the case of St. Anselm, whose writings seem to have made a profound and lasting impression on the mind of Hegel. For the great Archbishop's "*Ontological Proof of the Existence of God*" holds a curiously conspicuous place in the works of the German philosopher. It may be considered as an instance of intellectual kinship making itself felt in spite of the barriers opposed by the difference of time, and race, and religion. The famous argument of St. Anselm was disputed at once by the mediæval monk, Gaunilo. And in spite of the Archbishop's answer, it was rejected as invalid by St. Thomas and the main body of the schoolmen. Revived in a later age by Descartes and his followers, in a somewhat modified form, it was roughly handled in a well-known chapter of Kant's "*Kritik der Reinen Vernunft*." Yet, after all this long neglect and reiterated refutation, we find it taken up afresh by Hegel and explained and defended in many notable passages of his philosophical writings. It seems, we may say, to have a fascination for him, and he seizes every available opportunity of recurring to the subject.

Without pretending to give a complete list, we may mention the following instances: In the "*History of Philosophy*" the argument is naturally treated in the notices of St. Anselm as well as in those of Descartes and Kant.⁷ In the "*Logic of the Encyclopædie*" it is defended from Kant's criticisms; it is shown in its original form as it appears in St. Anselm, and after pointing out that Descartes and Spinoza had given it a more objective character, Hegel seeks

⁷ Hegel's *Werke*, Vol. XV., pp. 164, 349, 583.

to make it perfect in his own peculiar fashion.⁸ In the larger "Logic," again, the argument is discussed in various aspects in several parts of the work.⁹ In some of these instances the matter is merely touched on incidentally, though enough is said to show Hegel's sense of its importance. But in the second volume of the "Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion," and again in the appended special lectures on "The Proofs of the Existence of God," the Ontological Argument of St. Anselm is treated more fully and extensively.¹⁰ It is interesting to note that Hegel's last pages on the subject were written in 1831, shortly before he was cut off by the cholera. And it is here that his preference for this proof is expressed in the most decided manner. For he observes that it is generally used by later philosophers, "yet always along with the other proofs, although it alone is the true one."¹¹

Admirers of modern philosophy who affect to treat the schoolmen with contempt would do well to follow the example of Hegel in this matter. And in the same way we may say that some of our censorious critics of the German thinkers might well be reminded of the lesson left by the great mediæval masters. It is true that, in this case, we cannot have the same direct evidence. We have seen how Hegel treated St. Thomas and the other schoolmen. But where can we see how the Angelic Doctor would have treated Hegel? It would seem that this must be largely a matter of mere conjecture, on which each one of us may be left to form his own opinion. Yet, after all, there is some evidence that will at least carry us a certain way. For we can see how St. Thomas dealt with the heterodox works of philosophy current in his own day, and we may happily find that he showed a broader and more tolerant spirit than some of his modern disciples.

It is sometimes assumed, or asserted, that the mediæval schoolmen accepted the sound philosophy of Aristotle as authoritative, and roundly rejected the false teaching of the other systems. We all know the conventional formula that is used to explain the changed attitude of the Church authorities in regard to the works of Aristotle. It was an Aristotle corrupted by Arabic translators that was condemned, while the real Greek philosopher was made the oracle of orthodoxy. But though the character of the commentaries was one of the causes of this initial condemnation of the texts, the facts, we fancy, were not quite so simple as the theory. Translations from the Greek were among the first to fall under

⁸ Werke, Vol. VI., pp. 112, 362 ff.

⁹ "Wissenschaft der Logik," I., pp. 27, 56; II., pp. 81, 138; III., p. 192, original Nürnberg edition, 1812-16.

¹⁰ Hegel's Werke, Vol. XII., pp. 210 ff, 246 ff.

¹¹ "Obgleich er allein der wahrhafte ist," l. c. p. 547.

censure; and much was ultimately accepted from the Arabs. Here, again, the issue has been confused by the want of direct acquaintance with the original sources. How many of those who glibly echo the common charge of corruption, have ever read a line of Aristotle in Arabic? Those who have some experience of the way in which some of these translators accomplished their peculiarly difficult task would surely speak with more moderation on this matter. And, indeed, without any tinge of Oriental learning, we might be saved from this mistake by a closer acquaintance with the writings of St. Thomas, who made use of much that came from the hands of these despised Arabic interpreters, though he justly preferred versions made directly from the Greek original.

In this matter the most instructive instance is his treatment of the celebrated book "*De Causis*." This, as the reader may be reminded, was translated from an Arabic adaptation of a treatise of Proclus, the Neo-Platonist, and was falsely ascribed to Aristotle himself. Here, it might be said, was a typical case of Arab corruption. And it is scarcely surprising to find that it incurred condemnation and was branded, probably with some justice, as a source of heresy and other errors. On this point it will be enough to cite the words of Archbishop Vaughan:

"William of Auvergne was bound to censure a string of propositions, which were taken from the worst Arabic commentators on Aristotle, or from that deadly book, '*De Causis*,' which had so baneful an influence in the middle ages."¹²

But how did St. Thomas himself treat this "deadly book?" He made it the subject of a systematic and discriminating commentary, which is one of the most valuable of his purely philosophical writings. And while he justly rejects the view that it belongs to Aristotle, and recognizes its true source in the work of "Proclus the Platonist," he does not shrink from adopting some of its principles and incorporating them in his own large-minded system of philosophy. This is especially the case with that pregnant principle of Proclus, which may be said to give the key to the scholastic theory of knowledge, "*omne quod recipitur in aliquo, est in eo per modum recipientis*."¹³

St. Thomas, we may add, makes good use of this principle elsewhere in his works, notably in the "*Summa Theologiae*" and in the "*Summa contra Gentes*," and he takes care to cite the authority of

¹² "Life and Labors of St. Thomas of Aquin," Vol. I., p. 405.

¹³ See St. Thomas, "Quaest. Disp. De Potentia," qu. 3, art. 3, obj. 1; "Lib. De Causis," lectio x. "Et similiter aliqua ex rebus non recipit quod est supra eam nisi per modum secundum quem potest recipere ipsum, non per modum secundum quem est res recepta."

the "Book on Causes."¹⁴ And it is clearly, as Canon Kaufmann justly considers it, one of the fundamental principles of the scholastic philosophy. These facts are well worthy of note, for they furnish a much needed corrective to the popular conception that Scholasticism was nothing but a servile following of Aristotle. And what is more to our present purpose, the good use which St. Thomas made of the truth contained in the pages of the Platonist theologian and his Arab interpreter should show his modern disciples how to deal with the philosophy of Kant or Hegel.

What has been said so far may happily help to recommend a dispassionate comparison of the philosophy of Hegel with that of the schoolmen, in place of that narrow spirit which would set up the one as an oracle and treat the other with contemptuous hostility. Little good can be hoped from a barren and bitter controversy, from Liberal sneers at the schoolmen or scholastic gibes at the great German philosophers. But without leading to any reversal of the main position, or to the abandonment of anything that has been made good in the past, a candid comparison may at least serve to set both systems in a truer light, and give us a clearer view of their respective merits or shortcomings. It is, in any case, a large subject, and one of some delicacy and difficulty. And the suggestions here offered can be taken as little more than a tentative proposal. The actual accomplishment of the comparison could not be attempted in these pages with anything like completeness. Still, before we leave the subject, we may venture to touch on some of the distinctive characteristics of the modern and the mediæval masters, and note some curious points of resemblance or analogy in the philosophical methods of Hegel and the schoolmen.

Let us say once more that, while we find much to admire both in the old and in the new philosophers, we should be the last to doubt or deny the broad and deep differences by which they are divided. Nor is the difference confined to the matter of their teaching. In outward fashion, in methods, in style and language they often present a curious contrast. It is a far cry from the luminous perspicuity of St. Thomas, the rare combination of deep thoughts and clear language, to that proverbial obscurity which Hegel seems to hold as a heritage from his master Heraclitus:

*Clarus ob obscuram linguam magis inter inanes
Quamde gravis inter Græcos qui vera requirunt.*

The obscurity of the German philosophy, like that which is commonly ascribed to a great English poet, has often been made the subject of jest. It has even brought his name into the inimitable

¹⁴ Cf. S. Th. I., II., qu. 5, art. 5; II. II., qu. 23, a. 6, ad. 1. Contra Gentes, II., 98, etc.

Breitman Ballads, where it is coupled in humorous condemnation with that of Jean Paul Richter :

"Ash der Hegel say of his system—dat only von mans knew,
Vot der tyfel id meant—and he couldn't teil—und der Jean Paul Richter, too,
Who saidt: "Gott knows I meant somedings vhen foorst dis buch I writ,
Boot Goot only wise vot das buch means now—for I hafe fergotten it!"¹⁵

Yet with all this difference, the great mediæval schoolman and the German philosopher have some common characteristics. Both alike were vigorous and original thinkers; both had made an extensive study of ancient Greek philosophers, seizing their meaning and setting it forth with a new force and vitality. Both alike had thought out a large and ordered system, a world in which they could tread with sure steps and serene confidence. Both alike have lofty ideals and pure moral teaching. And, whatever objections may be brought against some of the opinions, neither can ever be accused of skepticism, or pessimism, or materialism.

One obvious point of analogy is the unity and comparative simplicity of their respective philosophical systems. In the scholastic philosophy the same principles and the same formulæ find an application in the most widely different and distinct subjects. Thus the composition of matter and form, as two distinct and correlative elements is seen alike in the material world, in the lowest forms of life, in the nature of man and in the supernatural region of the sacramental system. Much the same may be said of the distinction between *actus* and *potentia*, or of that principle of Proculus which found its chief application in the scholastic analysis of human knowledge. And in like manner the Hegelian "Dialektik" provides one common formula as the law of life and progress in the whole world of thought and being. Turn where we may in Hegel's voluminous writings, we are still confronted by the working of the same principles. In the science of logic, in material nature, in the wide and varied field of history, in the changing systems of philosophy or religion, we still find the same three stages or moments, the same *concordantia discordantium*, or the blending of contradictory forces in a higher unity.

It is true that this same dialectic formula, with its corresponding axioms regarding the identity of Being and Nothing, and the identity of Thought and Being, is in direct conflict with some of the cherished tenets of Catholic philosophy. And this may be considered as the head and front of Hegel's offending. For there is certainly nothing in his teaching that has been more resolutely

¹⁵ Als Hegel auf dem Todtbette lag, sagte er: "Nur Einer hat mich verstanden, "aber gleich darauf fügte er verdriesslich hinzu: "Und der hat mich auch nicht verstanden." Heine, "Zur Geschichte der Religion und Philosophie in Deutschland," Buch III.

rejected or made the subject of more relentless ridicule. To some this identity of contradictories must surely seem a startling novelty, unworthy of serious consideration. Yet, strange to say, it was first put forward by one of the founders of Greek philosophy; for Hegel has clearly borrowed it from his master Heraclitus. Or as Matthew Arnold puts the matter, "Hegel seized a single pregnant sentence of Heraclitus and cast it, with a thousand striking applications, into the world of modern thought."¹⁶ And, it is only fair to add, Hegel himself frankly allows his obligations to the Greek philosopher. For when he comes to treat of the doctrines of Heraclitus, in his "History of Philosophy," he exclaims: "Here we see land," adding significantly that he has adopted all the Greek author's principles in his own "Logic."¹⁷ St. Thomas, on the other hand, when he comes across one of these sayings of Heraclitus, in his comments on the *Metaphysics*, apparently agrees with Aristotle in regarding it as incredible.¹⁸

Yet, strange as it may seem, there is something in the main lines of the scholastic method that presents a curious analogy to the Hegelian Dialectic. In the popular conception of scholasticism, the first place is generally given to the use of formal syllogistic reasoning. But, though it is true that this plays an important part, especially in the pages of the later scholastic writers, it is by no means the chief characteristic of the mediæval methods. In St. Thomas and Scotus and the other great masters of the school, the most distinctive feature is surely the continued balancing of contrary arguments on every question that comes under discussion. And the conclusion results not simply from the premises of a syllogism, but from the counterpoise of opposing principles. Every article in the "Summa" has its array of objection and answers, and the balance is struck in the body of the article, not always by simply rejecting the objections, but rather by allowing them some force and bringing the whole into harmony by means of some subtle or profound distinction. If we turn to the larger and more elaborate articles of the "*Quæstiones Disputatae*," we may see this yet more plainly. For here the conclusion is often preceded by two series of objections from opposite quarters.

As some recent writers have shown, this method apparently owes its origin to the "*Sic et Non*" of Abelard, wherein the opposing arguments were brought together, but were left without a solution.

In much the same way we may regard the Kantian "antimonies"

¹⁶ Spinoza and the Bible, "Essays in Criticism," p. 281.

¹⁷ "Hier sehen wir Land; es ist kein Satz des Heraklit, den ich nicht in meine Logik aufgenommen." Hegel's Werke, Vol. XIII., p. 328.

¹⁸ In lib. IV. *Metaphysic*, lectio vi.

as the source of Hegel's Dialectic, which seeks to blend the two contradictories in a higher unity. Let us not be mistaken. We are by no means suggesting that the mediæval and modern methods are identical. It is merely a question of resemblance or analogy. What may be the source of this resemblance is another matter, on which there is room for difference of opinion. Some may possibly consider it a case of accidental coincidence. But there is some reason to believe that, after all, the root lies deeper. If we are not much mistaken, the mediæval method has its foundation in facts which are also the real basis of Hegel's theory. In a word, every truth is made up of diverse elements blended together in unity, or of opposing forces that must be held in equilibrium. Or if we turn to the higher mysteries of religion, we find Cardinal Newman saying of the doctrine of the Trinity, "The Catholic truth in question is made up of a number of separate propositions, each one of which, if maintained without the rest, is a heresy."¹⁹ And it is not too much to say that the whole history of heresies and of doctrinal definitions continually offers fresh illustrations of this principle, *e. g.*, in Nestorius and Eutyches, as in Sabellius and Arius. It is the same in other and lower fields. In every form of life and activity we find a similar oscillation between two opposite poles, dogmatism and skepticism in speculation, despotism and anarchy in politics, layism and rigorism in morals. Account for them as we may, we cannot get rid of these facts. Nor can we doubt that this is the source of the systematic balancing of arguments on either side, and the subtle distinction allowing each its due weight, that is the distinctive feature of the scholastic method. And surely no one who is familiar with the writings of Hegel, and knows how he was wont to dwell on these familiar examples in natural and political changes, or how he too boldly ventures into the mysteries of religion, can doubt that this is the reality which he seeks to seize and set forth in his dialectic principle.

In saying this we must not be taken to admit the accuracy or adequacy of the Hegelian formula. If it be not the empty paradox which it appears to most of its hostile critics, it is still likely enough that the truth it contains is, to say the least, overstrained and overstated. We fear to refine too much or to indulge in idle fancy. But we may venture to observe that in thus carrying it to an excess Hegel does but furnish a fresh illustration of his own fundamental principle. He has dwelt with his wonted force on the facts that seem to show the working of the dialectic process as he considers it, in every region of thought and being. All that is finite is in movement; life bears within it the seed of death; every state or

¹⁹ "Development on Christian Doctrine," p. 11.

every action, when carried to its extreme, passes into its own opposite. Anarchy runs into despotism; the extremes of joy and sorrow are nigh to one another. *Summum jus summa injuria*.²⁰ And the history of his philosophy, with its conflict of the Hegelians of the left wing and the right, and the destructive critics who came forth from the school to pursue a course at variance with the master's main teaching may well seem to be but another instance in illustration.

But if, as is likely enough, the German philosopher has made too much of this double aspect of truth and this union or equilibrium of opposite forces, may we not say that in our own schools the matter has hitherto attracted too little attention? The schoolmen have proceeded by the careful balancing of opposing arguments. And doctrinal development has been wrought out by the ceaseless strife of contradictory opinions and heresies. But, for the most part, we have been content to take the facts, without seeking to get beyond them and grasp the underlying principle. Yet if any candid student will carefully consider the matter, he will probably be ready to allow that there is more than meets the eye in this warring of opposing forces. Let him take, for instance, the doctrinal definition of Chalcedon, and consider the course of the controversy which issued in that luminous statement of the whole Catholic dogma. This instance is specially worthy of note, not only because here the two sides of the truth are so distinctly marked, but also by reason of the fact that here, besides the opposite heresies smitten by this two-edged sword, there were two Catholic schools in the controversy. One of these was led to lay so much stress on one side of the doctrine that some of its language might almost seem to give some countenance to the Monophysite error; while the attitude taken up by some of the other school laid them open to a suspicion of favoring Nestorianism. Both the definition and the controversy from which it issued serve to show the need of recognizing both sides of a truth and of preserving the diverse forces in due equilibrium.

This consideration suggests a further reflection on the subject of errors in philosophy or religion—a reflection which is, indeed, one of the main motives of the conciliatory attitude adopted in these pages. Possibly some zealous guardians of orthodoxy may be inclined to view this tenderness for a non-Catholic philosopher with some misgiving. And a dispassionate comparison of Hegel with the schoolmen may perhaps be regarded as an implied admission of the German writer's doctrine on the principle of contradiction. If only to prevent this possible misconception, it may be worth while

²⁰ Cf. *Encyklopädie* 81. *Werke*, Vol. VI., p. 152 ff.

to state our own view on this matter. It has at least the merit of being based on the principles of Catholic philosophy. And, if we may venture to say so, the opposite method of treating heterodox systems as something wholly evil always seems to us to imply the unconscious admission of a sort of intellectual Manicheism. Every being as such is good; and the existence of pure undiluted evil is impossible. Even so, it seems to us every body of doctrine that holds sway in the minds of men must needs contain some elements of truth. For falsehood, like evil, is a negation; and the existence of pure genuine undiluted error is impossible. The most degraded forms of paganism have retained some truths of natural religion or, maybe, some faint traces of primitive revelation. All the sects, however far from the centre of Catholic unity, bear with them some remnants of Christian doctrine; and all the philosophical systems from Thales to Schopenhauer contain some of the true principles of divine philosophy.

Unfortunately, controversialists generally lay stress on the errors alone and pay little or no heed to the better elements contained in the systems of their opponents. Hence it is hardly too much to say that for the average student who forms his notions from the text-books of his masters, heresiarchs and founders of philosophies are nothing more than monstrous personifications of their real or supposed errors. Who knows or cares what Catholic doctrines were retained by Pelagius or Luther, or what principles of sound philosophy were still preserved by Hume or Hegel? Yet these things must surely be taken into account, if we would form a just estimate of the men or of their systems. Nor is this all. We may even go further and discern some germ of truth, however disguised and distorted, in the very errors themselves. Not only do the most abandoned heretics hold fast to the faith in other matters, but for the most part the heresy itself is a truth that has not been grasped in all its bearings, but is isolated and thus strained or distorted.

It is to be feared that the champions of orthodoxy are too often content to lay stress on the particular dogma which has been denied by the heretic, without paying attention to the true principles which he has thus misapprehended. This was seen in the case of the controversy in the time between the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon. And it is not less conspicuous in the common treatment of modern Pantheism. It is well to lay stress on the objective reality of material things and the infinite distance between the creature and the Creator. But we could wish that some other parts of Catholic teaching were brought out more prominently in this connection. The conception of creation should be completed by

the profound scholastic speculations on conservation and the Divine *concursus*, and by the teaching that God is not only the maker but the *causa exemplaris*, and the meanest material creature is but an expression of the Divine ideas, shadowing forth the perfections of Him in whom "we live and move and have our being."

It might help to clear the air of much needless strife and barren controversy if this principle were more frequently remembered in our doctrinal discussions. For the full and frank recognition of the truth that is held by our opponents would not endanger any Catholic doctrine, while it might do much to provide some common ground and draw us all together. And, to return to our more immediate object, the application of the same principles would have an equally happy effect in the field of philosophy. Doubts and difficulties and matters of contention would still be there in abundance; but at least the strain and stress of the situation would be sensibly lightened. And devout disciples of the mediæval masters of Catholic philosophy and admirers of the great thinkers of modern Germany would happily find that they have much in common when once they cease to waste their strength in barren strife and censorious criticism. Once more, there is no need of breaking with the past or of condemning the present. We can hold fast to the old Catholic philosophy of St. Thomas and St. Augustine; for it is not dead but living, and is yet capable of further growth and progress. And at the same time, following the example of the mediæval masters, we need not fear to adopt whatever of good and true has fallen from the lips of later teachers of our own time. All truth is ours, no matter who has said it. *Ne quaeras quis hoc dixerit; sed ad quid dicatur attende.* In this spirit we have ventured to attempt the task of making a candid and dispassionate study of the writings of Hegel and the schoolmen.

W. H. KENT, O. S. C.

Bayswater, London, England.

HOME RULE AND MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S ZOLLVEREIN.

AT the termination of August political parties in England were still in dire confusion on account of Mr. Chamberlain's revolt from the doctrine of Free Trade. The importance of this departure for us rests exclusively on its bearing on the prospects of Home Rule. He is the declared enemy of that policy, and if he be a man of great influence on the electorate, his opposition must count for much. There no doubt is a crumb of comfort in the result of the Barnard Castle election, at which the Government candidate was defeated.¹ The bewilderment and alarm of the masses of the people, just after the formal announcement of the economic doctrine of "The dear loaf," as a means to secure increased wages and provide a fund for pensions in old age, do not seem to have so utterly demoralized them as Mr. Chamberlain and his admirers had hoped. He was the only "strong man," his was the only cool head in the crisis—which, by the by, was a crisis of his own creation—and the frightened people had no resource except to turn to him. At all events, the election has this value: we see from it that the masses are not moving to him any more than the economists.

About the end of June or beginning of July he solemnly warned the members of the Constitutional Club against Home Rule. It was scotched, not killed, he told them, and would again enter the arena. There was no need of a prophet to declare a secret which the magazines and the daily and weekly papers were discussing as a practical question. The very air was vibrating with the electricity released by the Land Purchase Bill. It was not an accident that two measures of such supreme consequence to Ireland were linked in the public mind. Without accepting Mr. A. Balfour's opinion that the Land Question is the history of Ireland, we may allow it so much value as to say it expresses partly the truth—this much, that the anarchy which was embodied in ferocious enactments and which exhibited itself in every form of social disorganization was mainly due to the exercise of powers over the soil and its inhabitants by men devoid of conscience and humanity. Mr. Balfour did not express the fact in this bald way, but he said what was practically the same when he stated that the history of the Land Question was the history of Ireland. What he failed to grasp was that apart from and above the question of the land was the political sense and the spiritual conception included in the word nationhood.

If the Irish were to be kept forever in subjection—and this, we

¹ The Argyle election is more important still as auguring a return to Mr. Gladstone's policy in its entirety.

submit, is a policy no one could advocate any more than he would slavery in the West India Islands or a reënactment of the disabilities of Dissenters—there should have been no interference with the social conditions prevailing during the reigns of Anne, George I. and George II. A people cannot be half emancipated. If you desire that they should be slaves, leave them nothing you can take away from them. This was the way the Irish landlords dealt with their tenants—and they were successful as long as they could so deal with them—but unfortunately there is a meddling, insolent, international conscience which condemns the recklessness of States in handing over duties and obligations to the cruel and licentious, the interested and corrupt. In addition, there is a certain public spirit latent among the people at large which may be aroused by appeals from men in whom they have confidence. As the Irish people, or the survivors of the triennial famines of two centuries, gradually found themselves in possession of a certain amount of political power, they began to use it to widen and deepen the foundations of their social strength and to aim at the realization of some respectable idea of individual life. Europe and America, all the world looked on, and so those wretched Irish squireens could not be allowed to disgrace the Empire by their pranks. When in their fatuity they allowed the *Times* to champion their cause in its own manner, to put them in the witness-box, where they disclosed nothing but their brogue and their bad English, their planter-like brutality and unconsciousness of any rights which their tenants possessed under the sky, they committed class suicide. As a result they were to be destroyed as a social and political power sooner or later, and fortunately for them, the Government of Tories and other enemies of the Irish people in bestowing the death stroke on the landlords as a political party made their fortunes as individuals. But with the destruction of this class as a political party or power springs up of necessity the right of all other classes to political and social emancipation. The Irish people have obtained too much to be kept in a state of tutelage forever, as a transition from a state of slavery which as late as 1886 Lord Salisbury pronounced to have been made perpetual by the destiny that had in similar circumstances surrounded the Dutch with Hottentots to hew wood and draw water for them. Home Rule must follow the policy of land transfer if content is to remain for any time, and this because it is the completion and fulfilment of the policy of land transfer.

The question has come back to life in no uncertain manner. We are not, indeed, prepared to discover hidden meanings in the King's address to his people in Ireland, when he impresses on them the importance of working in union to develop the resources of their

country with such means and powers of local government as they possess; but we are very strongly inclined to think it would be to him a most pleasing duty to give his assent to a large measure of self-government. The separate nationality was recognized by his Majesty with a heartiness to cause satisfaction, and, we think, to give birth to hopes that the acknowledgment will not end in an acquiescence with a sentiment.

At any rate, since the Land Bill was spoken of the political idea came into prominence in various quarters and was looked at by men from different points of view as something within the range of practical politics. It is only among the Liberal Unionists, indeed, whose *raison d'être* is the denial of Home Rule, that the present political relations between England and Ireland must be maintained at any cost. It is rather a severe comment on this, that the respectable wing of the party, the Conservatives, are not quite in accord with all the Imperialist aspirations of the section just named. Sir Edward Clarke, one of the ablest lawyers in the last Parliament, was invited by the executive council of the Brighton Tories to stand for a seat which became vacant by the retirement of the sitting member about the first week of August. The significance of this invitation is that Sir Edward Clarke was the most outspoken opponent of the South African war, the most trenchant critic of Mr. Chamberlain's policy, the man who had made the striking appeal to Mr. Chamberlain during the height of the hostilities to retire for six months from public life, while at the same time assuring him that peace would be the instantaneous result of his retirement. We need not despair with such signs as the election at Barnard Castle and the invitation to Sir Edward Clarke pressing on us in the midst of the uncertainty and alarm of the masses of the English people; it is not so clear that "the strong man" is going to sweep the country at the next general election. We are aware that he has promises of immense resources from the South African magnates, and we fear that between the wealth of these plutocrats and the fears of the working man about his future that the enemy of Ireland will obtain a majority, but its influence, it is hoped, will only be temporary.

At any rate, he has committed himself to a fixed hostility to Home Rule; he has even gone away from that coquetting with Mr. Gladstone's first measure alluded to in Lord Coleridge's article in the *North American Review* for June to the farthest pole of antagonism. Taking him as a great influence in Imperial politics, he should be an object on which the united strength of the Liberal-Radical party and the Irish Parliamentary party must be precipitated. Though we are not amongst those who think him a statesman, we see in him the most formidable opponent of the Irish demand. As we have

said, the English people will look for guidance in this time of divided counsels to the man who seems to know his own mind as the one to lead them out of a position of difficulty and danger.

It is to be regretted that we do not possess authoritative documents² which could be published for the electors in every part of England concerning the events that led to the war in South Africa and authoritative information on the manner in which it was conducted. It would be well if we possessed some materials for forming a judgment on the status of the Transvaal and its sister republic and their relations to the Cape Government before the war. If Mr. Chamberlain be a man totally devoid of political conception and foresight, as we think him to be, we ought to have the means of proving this from the records of his dealings with the Boer administration and the Cape Government. For instance, was he the dupe of Mr. Rhodes? It must not be supposed that vast schemes are sufficient to prove that he who conceives them is a statesman; madness has been known to form large conceptions; vanity united to a quick and restless, but not capacious mind has before now busied itself in the disturbance of order. The unsettlement or resettlement of institutions has been the reformer's hobby since the dawn of political society. The mob had its demagogues against Moses, the little States of Greece were theatres of incessant turmoil; not even the law-abiding spirit of the Romans saved them from the agitator who became a dictator, the popular leader who became a despot. The people should be led to believe that Mr. Chamberlain is a charlatan.

Who would bear with Gracchus inveighing against sedition? But the three kingdoms must submit to Mr. Chamberlain when he says that the Home Rulers are rebels: though he tried to incite the Irish to desperate measures by saying to a great English meeting that government in Ireland was of the kind exercised by the Russians at the worst times in Poland, and the Austrians when they made Venetia one vast prison. Such language if spoken in Dublin or in an Irish country town, under Mr. Arthur Balfour's administration of the Irish office, by an Irish member of Parliament, would obtain for the latter "a plank bed" in the nearest prison; if it were employed by an Irish magistrate, it would, in addition to the plank bed, cause him to be superseded in the commission of peace; if it were used by an ordinary and unofficial tribune of the people, the speaker would carry the marks of a policeman's baton to the jail.³

² These have come to light since the above was written.

³ While on this topic we must mention that during the time referred to in the text it was said Mr. Balfour would not dare to act towards Englishmen as he was dealing with Irishmen. The reply was, if they spoke in

We must impress on every one to whom these lines shall go that the administration which succeeded the first Home Rule Government after the defeat of 1886 and the present administration were and are the most lawless and tyrannical since the Government of the Six Acts, which deprived the English people of every vestige of public liberty. It was only the other day that Englishmen, meeting to express their view on the continuance of that South African war which when the historian takes it up shall be written in the crimson characters of the Thirty Years' War of the sixteenth century or the burning words of the desolation of the Carnatic, were scattered by savage mobs with the approval of the first Ministers of the Crown. There is no good in mincing matters; we are not, as a great countryman might have said in view of the events of to-day, we are not to go into transports of mimic gratitude because a Land Purchase Bill has been passed, or a King has visited the country or a Lord Lieutenant is to be made a Marquis, or soldiers are to wear the shamrock on St. Patrick's Day. We say the whole force of the Liberal party and the Irish nation must be marshalled against the Government, of which the man who has wasted the wide territories of a simple race, religious according to their lights, is a member. The delusion which carries the electorate blindfold into the service of the Unionist league is that the old Radical who used to denounce the privileged classes as the enemies of liberty and progress, as persons who for their own selfish ends would have denied education to the people to the last, and who, when compelled to grant it, so maimed the concession that it came as a curse rather than as a blessing, the delusion is that he still stands for their cause amid the ranks of the high-born and the wealthy. He is among his new companions, they are led to understand; he is among those who toil not, it is said, not because he is faithless to the old creed, but because traitors in the party yielded to an association of crime and outrage and rebellion organized in Ireland against all who were loyal to the connection with England. It was not he or his fellow Liberal-Unionists, he persuades the people, who deserted the great party which had obtained every social and political and religious right by which the humble man is made in all essential things equal to the greatest noble, but it was the unscrupulous knot of place-seekers round a leader in his dotage and their unworthy supporters who betrayed the Liberal cause and endangered the stability of the

Ireland in the same manner as those batoned and imprisoned had done, he would. Mr. Shaw-Léfevre, an ex-Cabinet Minister, tested the Chief Secretary's *bona fides* by going over and addressing a public meeting of the incriminated kind. He returned to England unscathed. What is but a choleric word in the captain is flat blasphemy in the private; but here it was not even regarded as a choleric word; it was constitutional language.

Empire. And this interested representation of his going to the side of the men he had countless times assailed was accepted by the majority of the electors in England even when Mr. Gladstone's influence was higher than at any time since he took up Home Rule. We wish that the American people and the electors of the Three Kingdoms should take in the full significance of the forces supporting or opposing Home Rule—we do not mean in all their complexity, but with a sufficiently comprehensive and intelligent grasp, because from such a perception may arise the influence to overthrow this mischievous Minister.

Now, we may say that under the most favorable aspect in which we can present the Home Rule cause the majority of the English electors went against Mr. Gladstone and against the other two kingdoms and the Principality⁴ at both elections.

Morally, no doubt, the judgment of Scotland and Wales in the controversy is of incomparably higher value than that of England, if we can call hers a judgment at all; for who has ever listened to a man's being a judge in his own cause? Yet justice might be done in a rare case by an individual, but no one fit to remain a minute outside a lunatic asylum could suppose a powerful nation capable of equitable judgment concerning the affairs of a weaker one, helpless in her grasp and whose interests were in a greater or less degree in conflict with her own. Let it be borne in mind all along that the prominent consideration of every follower of Mr. Gladstone from the English ranks is: Whether self-government can be accorded to Ireland without detriment to England. This sense of the relation between the two kingdoms was by no one expressed with a more cynical frankness than by a Home Rule Premier, Lord Rosebery. This statesman declared that "Home Rule could not be conferred on Ireland until the consent of 'the predominant partner' was obtained," and this, he explained, meant a majority not of the Imperial Parliament, but a majority of English members of the Lower House. A division of the Liberal party agrees with him.

This, then, from an accredited source of Home Rule Liberalism is what the supporters of Mr. Gladstone's policy must bend themselves to the task of achieving. Either Home Rule must be indefinitely postponed, or the Home Rulers must capture the majority of seats in England; and meanwhile the Tories and the Liberal Unionists who out-Herod them in the establishment of an irresponsible militarism at home and the nourishing of a wild craze for aggressive expansion abroad may enjoy the fruits of office to their hearts content—the one section may pursue titles with wealth annexed, the other may hunt for wealth with titles annexed. At first sight one

⁴ Wales.

would think all this could have gone on nicely. The Government is in power with an immense majority in the Commons, while the House of Lords is their own; and so rich men could become men of rank, whilst aristocrats could become plutocrats; there was no Irish bugbear to cause discomfort—all was serene and the sky was blue. Why, then, should the Colonial Secretary have flung his bolt at such a time?

But the right honorable gentleman knows that the Fools' Paradise was in danger of being devastated; for hour by hour dark and sinister tidings were coming from the unhappy provinces his ambition, his want of knowledge and his audacity had handed over to the powers by whose aid weak nations are destroyed and strong ones sent upon the road to ruin. He deemed it necessary to divert the public attention by some new and striking issue.

We should not have bestowed so much time on Mr. Chamberlain were it not that we regard him as the special enemy of Irish autonomy and because we wish to supplement some things omitted from Lord Coleridge's article already referred to. There is a principle in human nature that makes men the determined enemies of those they wronged. There was no man who took a more decided part in dividing the Liberal party and checking the conversion of the English people to Home Rule than the Minister for the Colonies. Mr. Parnell had hurt that insatiable and restless vanity which, like a familiar spirit, is forever driving Mr. Chamberlain from one idea to another, one plan to another, one policy to another. He was impatient of the influence and authority of Mr. Gladstone, which he thought stood between him and the first place in the Liberal party. The Irish leader held the balance of power between the parties; he was the Warwick of Ministries. Mr. Chamberlain asked him⁵ to unite in shelving Mr. Gladstone. The Irish leader refused. Mr. Chamberlain asked for letters of recommendation to politicians and associations in Ireland, on the strength of which he and Sir Charles Dilke would start on a campaign through Ireland. It is said, as the consideration for such letters, he offered, on becoming Prime Minister, to grant whatever terms the Irish would demand as to the form and extent of self-government. As we are so far dealing with the right honorable gentleman's conduct as an important element in the history of the movement within the area of accepted party politics, we cannot avoid offering suggestions on certain pronouncements made by him since he became a Unionist. Mr. Parnell declined to give him the letters.

⁵ The particulars of this intrigue have not been fully disclosed, but what is said above is public property. We do not know to what extent a *cave* had been secured within the Liberal party pending the coöperation of Mr. Parnell.

We must now go back a little—only a few months, in fact, from the date of the proposal. Lord Carnarvon, who was Lord Lieutenant in 1885, had come to the conclusion that some considerable measure of legislative power over her own local or internal affairs must of necessity be conferred on Ireland, if the stability of the Empire were to be preserved and the good name of England rehabilitated before the civilized world. A negotiation between the noble Earl and Mr. Parnell was entered into with the consent of the Prime Minister, Lord Salisbury. All the world knew that this was going on; what was not known was how far Lord Carnarvon was the agent of the Premier and the limit of his powers of concession to Ireland. We beg the reader's attention to this matter.

It must be plain if the Tories were to settle the question of political relations with Ireland, Liberalism as a political influence would have become a thing of the past, a mere memory illuminated, no doubt, with brilliant passages to be ranted in the speeches of school-boys in their debating societies; to be debated with the great question: "Whether Phillip, having crossed the frontier of an alien State and the Herald having made proclamation, was Demosthenes justified in rising?"⁶ or "Ought the Judices have convicted Milo"—taking Cicero's presentation of the facts for the accused as substantially correct and having regard to the notoriously infamous character of Clodius? or whether the majority of the Court were right in Hampden's case—having regard to the precedents and the analogies from the muster by the land forces? With such questions Whig-Liberalism would be classed as a political power in the event named.

It is idle to suppose that the Liberal party would have seen one day of power since if Lord Salisbury had risen to the opportunity afforded him by a man fresh in the experience of governing Ireland within the Act of Union. To our Liberal friends this is a consideration of moment; to the Nonconformists, whose religious conscience does not so entirely overshadow their political conscience as to prevent them from accepting the support of Irish Papists on a Burial Bill, on a Welsh Disestablishment Bill, on a Public Worship Regulation Bill, or on any measure tending to make the Dissenter equal to the Churchman, we raise the reminder that the Tory and the Churchman, the squire and the parson would have been ruling England since 1885, and probably till 1995, if Ireland had been reconciled by Lord Salisbury. If the Liberals and the Nonconformists can point to a single measure widening public liberty for English-

⁶ Our readers will remember that this was the issue into which with infinite skill the great advocate turned the unanswerable impeachment by *Æschines*. No one would rise.

men and making personal liberty stronger and clearer passed without the aid of Irishmen, and above all Catholic Irishmen, and the passionate force of the desire of justice of these, working behind their representatives, they will tell of Acts of Parliament omitted from the journals of both Houses.

It is well known that Mr. Chamberlain has not one scintilla of that historical knowledge which belongs to philosophy, not one rudimentary principle of that political speculativeness which is the condition of those broad and masterly conceptions which constitute the science of government, and both of which—the philosophy of history and the philosophy of politics—are essential to the formation of a statesman's mind, yet he has that intense appreciation of historical facts lying in his way and political examples readily grasped which belong to the quick, ardent and limited understanding. He orates and writes despatches about "Suzerainty" before the war, without knowing what the word means; he talks of "Zolverein" until we are reminded of the one clown who imposes on his father by the word "ergo" "I say ergo," and the other clown who criticizes a speaker who uses the word "vent," as follows: "He heard the word from some great man and now he vents it on a fool," but he is keen enough to feel the forces near him. He saw what the Liberals had effected during the whole period from the beginning of the great Reform agitation by the aid of Ireland; he held in his hand, as every one held, the fact strong and portentous of the marvelous growth of the Home Rule movement in power in a few years. He conceived the idea that with such an ally or an instrument he would be able to sway the destinies of Britain more absolutely than Walpole had done or Pitt. He saw that if the Carnarvon negotiations should succeed, he might as well abandon the great theatre of imperial politics and return to the useful but not glorious occupation of presiding over the paving, lighting and sanitation of Birmingham. No career in world-wide politics lay before him if Home Rule were granted by the Tories.

It was then he approached Parnell and met with the rebuff which led to the inspiration of his later-day policy towards Ireland. And in this no one can really think that Mr. Parnell erred in judgment. We may venture to tell the tale of what might have been. Mr. Parnell and the Irish party united with Mr. Chamberlain and Sir Charles Dilke would have succeeded in preventing a Liberal administration under Mr. Gladstone holding power—they could not have prevented Mr. Gladstone being sent for to form an administration. The result would be that instead of holding the balance between the great parties in the kingdom, Mr. Parnell and his followers would be tied to an inconsiderable family clique distrusted by

every Liberal for whom party allegiance was a bond of duty or of honor. Disappointed by the result, Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Jesse Collings and the other members of the group would repent and beg to be taken back into the fold, but their Irish dupes would become the object of universal derision, as knaves who had obtained influence by pretending to patriotism and fools who could not use their influence wisely.

Possibly the right honorable gentleman may think it was fortunate that the Irish leader rejected his overtures, that had the latter not done so he would not have had the opportunity of sending his name through the Colonies as a household word and would not now have been standing as the still strong man among leaders in dismay and dissension and before a people dreading what the future may disclose. We cannot admire the judgment of the nation which looks to Mr. Chamberlain as a great and consistent statesman, but we can regard it with alarm; for upon it depends all forces now available for bringing Home Rule before Parliament with any prospect of success.

We know very well that the English democracy can be moved to enthusiasm for justice and humanity when appealed to by one in whom they have confidence. At the great election of 1868 the boroughs and cities were swept by the workingmen going to the polls with the battle-cry of "Justice to Ireland!" Again, when the great leader fulminated over the land against the deeds done in Bulgaria, the people, maddened at the account of what had been undergone by men, women and children in a distant land, united to them by no tie of race, or kindred, of language, of history, of religion, no bond but of that humanity which melts the heart at the tale of suffering, rouses its indignation against injustice and turns all its blood to flame at the mention of inexpressible wrongs, maddened at the account of these things, the people flung down the cold and insolent class government that had encouraged them.

But who is to reach the people now? We are informed that the cause of Ireland, which is the cause of the English democracy, now, as surely as at any time for seventy or eighty years, is to sink in abeyance in the campaign Mr. Chamberlain has provoked. In one sense we hold the Liberals excusable for not giving it the old prominence. In the first place, those who call themselves the Liberal League, and who seem to possess a sort of Birmingham-electioneering-agent activity, have expunged Home Rule from what they call the "slate"—this League, we say, must be taken into reckoning. Their proper place is with Mr. Chamberlain and the Liberal Unionists, but they refuse to go over because they think there is a better chance of office when their own betrayed party comes into power

than among aristocrats in an administration headed by the great house of Barnacle. Next the party itself, of which the acknowledged leaders are Lord Spencer in the House of Lords and Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman in the House of Commons, are placed in this difficulty: that Mr. Chamberlain, the master spirit of wire-pulling, ostentatiously threw down the gauntlet to Home Rule, and he selected the moment he was pronouncing an invective of innuendo against Free Trade for the performance. Not a single act of Mr. Chamberlain but must be watched. The occasion we refer to was that when the Constitutional Club presented him with an address and settled itself with due obsequiousness to hear him on "the dear-loaf" which would increase rents if the prophets of Protection are right in their economics.⁷

We certainly have no desire to play his game, but the cause must not be allowed to wait. Every hour is bringing the Irish nation nearer to death; emigration is bleeding her white. If this is to continue, we wonder who in a few years' time will be living on the lands bought by Mr. Wyndham's peasant proprietors under the bill to pacify Ireland. It is almost a word of ill omen, this word pacify. As we write it down—*facient solitudinem vocant pacem* echoes down the centuries since Tacitus described the masterful and appalling policy by which what Pliny called the immense majesty of the Roman peace was established in so many places. The echoes reverberate from shore to shore of Ireland and from century to century. In good Catholic days "the mere Irishman" was a beast of chase called "a wood kerne," to be hunted as they hunt tigers now in India, as they make forest toils in Eastern Europe, as they used to beat woods in France for the wild boar and coverts in England for the stag. Under Queen Mary and her Spanish husband the districts called Leix and Offaly are described in English State papers as full of houses in the midst of good pastures and well-tilled fields and traversed by excellent roads, but their Majesties' armies came and "pacified"⁸ them, so that they might be colonized by English settlers. Well, ever since they are known as Kings county and Queens county. We shall say no more than that this is not a question to be decided according to religious belief or opinion, this hunting of wood kerns. In England, indeed, the Catholics may be the natural allies of the Tories, but the Tories of Ireland are a mere

⁷ We doubt this result as a permanent one, even though the Birmingham Tariff Committee says the taxation of wheat will bring back to cultivation thousands of acres. Increased taxes on food would send the workmen to America.

⁸ We wonder was it for giving shelter to the Protestants who fled to Ireland from the persecution in England. At any rate the Irish Catholics behaved in that scandalously humane way towards the English Protestants.

revolutionary faction, enemies of law and order in all ranks, partial and prejudiced as magistrates, seditious as pressmen, untamed savages in the lower walks of life—men whose motto in business of any kind is the exclusion of Papists, whose pastime on the great festivals of their political creed is murder and arson. Consequently, the Irish people have no allies with whom they can safely act except the great party which made the restoration of their lost legislature a Cabinet question and a perpetual issue. Nevertheless, the cause must not wait even for the great Liberal party. Now, to this point we must address ourselves in a few sentences and, we think, in a fair and reasonable manner.

Before the starting of the movement we all know as that of Home Rule, but on the very eve of it, proposals for the readjustment of the connection had frequently been suggested both in Ireland and England. Even in the early forties Lord John Russell seems to have framed a federal arrangement. Not an uncommon idea was that of a system of rotary Parliaments, Dublin having its turn; and this is in the main the scheme advocated in the article in the *Nineteenth Century* for June contributed to the subject by Sir Henry Drummond Wolff. A remark he there makes is worth recalling: He considers that the restricted legislative power conferred on the local legislature in the constitution, he sketches, would be a foundation for the system of Imperial federation with which, he informs us, Mr. Chamberlain is credited. The possibility of any such solution as this through Mr. Chamberlain may at once be dismissed. The latter has nailed his colors to the mast: no form of self-government for Ireland; though it is said that to preserve a certain consistency on account of the offer made to Mr. Parnell he was prepared when the Unionists first went into power to support a system of provincial parliaments⁹ in Ireland as distinguished from a national legislature. Anything less statesmanlike and more malicious it would be impossible to conceive. The provincial parliament of Connaught would not possess one useful element of local government because the area is too large and the interests are too diverse; it would not possess a single principle of national government because it had no power to control the other provinces. The same might be said with regard to each of the other provinces, and so each of them would stand in the Imperial system as a monument of legislative impotence. Their counsels would be without influence at Westminster and the result would be that, exasperated beyond endurance, they would employ their resources and their time in agitating for a national parliament.

We frankly confess that in our opinion the situation has been

⁹ That is, a parliament for each of the four provinces of Ireland.

changed by the Land Purchase Bill. The administration of a somewhat similar measure announced by Mr. Gladstone in 1886 was to be in the hands of an Irish executive responsible to an Irish parliament. This was beyond all question supreme practical statesmanship. The landlords recklessly refused the offer to purchase such of their estates as were in the hands of tenants entitled to the benefit of the Land Law Act of 1881 or the entire estates if they preferred to dispose of them to the Imperial Government. It cannot be said that they feared the administration in this behalf of a Home Rule Parliament, since all that was needed, if they could not trust such an authority, was to sell out. So far from their refusal to accept the measure, receiving sympathy from Englishmen at first disposed to grant rather liberal terms, the latter came to look upon them as hopelessly irreconcilable, and suggested with grim sarcasm that they should be handed over to the tender mercies of Parnell's Parliament. For their own sake and that of the country, it was a pity they had not been. Much suffering would have been escaped. Parnell himself, we think, would have dealt with them liberally; yet his was the hard mind and the inexorable spirit of political vindictiveness they had most to dread. We are convinced their own Parliament would have gone beyond the bounds of reason to gratify them as an inducement to stay in the country and join in building her up.

So sure are we of the spirit of the majority that if the Protestant Church had been disestablished by an Irish Parliament in which Catholics preponderated, there would have been no disendowment or hardly any disendowment. The establishment of religious equality for Protestant, Presbyterian, Catholic, Jew, what not, would be the aim of the majority. Can any one doubt it? A Jew at the earliest moment he was qualified to sit in the Corporation of Dublin was elected alderman for a ward so Catholic that it is doubtful if ten per cent. of the burgesses were of any other religion. A Jew would not have the ghost of a chance in any ward in which the Protestants were the majority at the time, and what is more, Alderman Harris, the Jew in question, carried on the business of a money-lender, a pursuit not calculated to make a man popular. It was simply because he was a Jew and to emphasize their boast that Irish Catholics alone among peoples never made Jews suffer civil or social disqualification that they elected him. We ourselves think it was a rather gratuitous act of liberality, but no one can despise the motive which prompted it.

But, as we were saying, if the Land measure of the Chief Secretary is to succeed, it can only be by making it the business of an Irish administration to carry out all its details one by one, to collect the instalments of purchase money and transmit them to the Ex-

chequer. The confidence Mr. Wyndham reposes in boards of administration is only equaled by his trust that the powers of nature will so watch over the interests of tenant-purchasers that one will see everywhere bursting granaries, healthy stock, overflowing milk pails and green crops so abundant that a large part must be given back as manure to the soil. It is to be feared that this picture does not foreshadow the things to come.

On another occasion we said administration by boards was the bane of Ireland. What does it mean? Simply that certain departments spend the money appropriated to all the branches of administration without any responsibility to the country, without regard for her interests and with the most sublime contempt for the opinion of the masses of her people. If any head of a department is heretic enough to consider it his duty to discharge his functions with a care for the public interest, he is got rid of in some way or other, either by being pensioned off, like Sir Thomas Brady from the Fisheries' Board; promoted like Sir Robert Hamilton from the important office of Under Secretary, or if an official of high and coördinate jurisdiction like Mr. Murrough O'Brien, simply omitted from a new appointment of his colleagues. Sir Robert Hamilton is not an Irishman; the other gentlemen named are Irish Protestants.

The scandals of the valuation office were at one time the subject of discussion. It is difficult to see how a board of this kind could be made serviceable to the interests of a political party, but this is the allegation. The gentleman responsible for the charge we have in view was not a Nationalist or a Catholic. He was an orthodox Whig, a Privy Councillor, a member of Parliament and connected by marriage with the Duke of Bedford and a some time Prime Minister, Lord John Russell, afterwards Earl Russell. The charge made by this right honorable gentleman was that the Revisers of valuation adjusted the values of the various townlands from time to time in such a manner, when there was a £12 franchise in counties, as to give a preponderance to the Tory interest. If the valuation of a holding were returned at £11 19 a year, there was no vote. Consequently a reduction to the extent of a few shillings might easily be made to deprive the tenants of a Whig landlord of the franchise, and by adding a few shillings to transfer the franchise to those of a Tory landlord. This could be accomplished without altering the general valuation of a division that constituted the valuation unit. That is to say, as long as the valuation of the entire unit remained the same, alterations in the component parts of it did not conflict with the rules of the Department. It was perfectly legal, however corrupt the motive. That the changes could be effected is indubitable; that they were effected is the charge.

The importance of a Board of Works for promoting improvements of all kinds cannot be overestimated in any country, but in a country whose inhabitants depended solely on natural agents for a livelihood, in comparison with it, all other departments may hardly be regarded as of any account. If a malicious spirit presided over this bureau in Ireland and had cast a spell on its administration, so as to bring about the effect that any work fairly well done should be work not wanted at all, or that any work needed, if attempted, should be done so badly as to be useless, we might have the explanation of its blundering and incompetence. Why, it was the laughing stock of all classes, who with that queer, wild humor common to the whole race, high and low, gentle and simple, the criminal extravagance and absurd performances of this Department, were forgiven for the merriment they provoked. And then it was so high and mighty, with its dwelling in cloudland, above opinion, certain to be backed by the Treasury benches in Parliament and the Castle at home, that it was well for the people they possessed this unconquerable sense of the ridiculous. We will go no further into these matters, but we may ask is it not time that the boards should be placed under a strong home government that will compel them to perform their work efficiently? We think so.

It is to such another irresponsible office the Chief Secretary is committing the administration of his Land Measure. There are certain considerations open to us from his account of some of the securities he holds forth for its successful working and the protection of the Imperial taxpayer from ultimate liability. From certain savings to be effected and from the appropriation of a definite amount coming to Ireland¹⁰ he calculates a borrowing basis to the extent of two hundred millions sterling. We have in this fact ground for the application of Mr. Gladstone's principle of making the statutory parliament to be created under the Home Rule Bill of 1886 a buffer between the Irish tenant-purchaser and the Exchequer, and an agent for this last-named institution in collecting and remitting the instalments.

As the Land Purchase Bill settles the conditions of sale, the most useful and important part to be played by mere commissioners is withdrawn from the board. It is nothing more than a conveyance office so far as the transactions between landlords and tenants are concerned, that is to say, an office to prepare the instrument by which the title to the landlord's interest, whatever that may be, is

¹⁰ This is a proportion to the sum granted to England in aid of education which is allotted to Ireland for local purposes. The Chief Secretary hypothesizes it to indemnify the British tax-payers. The Irish tax-payer is of no account at all, though he pays the bill for landlords and tenants.

conveyed to the tenant-purchaser. It is not the business of this board to ascertain whether or not the *tenant-purchaser* proposes a payment beyond the value of what the landlord has to sell or to refuse assent even though the average purchase price the landlord is to receive, taking Ireland as a whole, is at the very least twice the value of the fee simple, the measure practically concludes the bargain. In a note there¹¹ is a reference to estates on which the tenants were in chronic arrears simply because it was only in exceptionally flourishing seasons that the rent could be paid. The landlords sold their holdings to the tenants under the Ashbourne Acts at an excessive price and under threat of eviction, a coercion stronger to the small farmer in Ireland than a long term of penal servitude.

It is out of the question but that numerous transactions of this kind took place under the measures just mentioned. It was the duty of the Commissioners to protect the tenants and the Exchequer against oppression of the tenants in the making of the bargains. The only one who endeavored to do so with a constant sense of duty was Mr. O'Brien, whose name has been already mentioned. But now the agreement for sale and purchase will be all that concerns the Commissioners; and yet they are to collect the instalments and transmit them to the Exchequer in operations for which there is pledged an Irish fund equivalent to a borrowing power of £200,000,000. To the fulfilment of the engagement the whole Irish nation is pledged, with the exception of the landlords who refused to delegate representatives to the Dunraven Conference; and these, if we mistake not, possess among them the greatest number of acres, if they are not the greatest number individually. A very significant incident is the prosecution of his suit against the United Irish League by Lord de Freyne after lying low during the months in which negotiations were going on between the representatives of the tenants and of the amenable landlords.

It is fair to state that an impression is said to prevail, one on which the policy of Land Purchase has been based by Lord Ashbourne, Mr. Balfour and the Chief Secretary, namely, that the ten-

¹¹ The writer of this article in 1883 was sent by the Land Commission to investigate the condition of the tenants on the estates of the London Companies in the County of Derry, in order—and to judge whether the applications for the benefit of the Arrears Act were *bona fide*, assuming he held that the legal questions of a preliminary kind on which his jurisdiction depended should be decided in their favor. Some difficult or special cases which had come before his predecessors in the county in sittings at the close of the year 1882 were the only ones not adjudged in favor of the tenants by these gentlemen out of several hundreds, and these were excepted only on legal points and not on the merits. They came before him for rehearing, and having decided the questions of law in the tenants' favor, there was no choice but to decide the questions of fact, which simply amounted to this—that the rents were excessive.

ants look to the immediate benefit from the completion of sale and not to the amount of money to be paid in instalments spread over a long term of years. The immediate benefit in all the schemes is that the annual instalment of the purchase money to be paid is less than the yearly rent. Considering this, critics in the leading magazines and on platforms expressed their wonder at such transactions being called purchases at all, instead of gifts made by the Government of the landlord's interest in each instance to the tenants. It would be idle to correct this notion, for the Exchequer expects to be paid principal and interest, the latter carefully calculated with regards to the credit of the State.

Assuming that an excessive price will have been paid for the landlord's interest in the holdings and that the Exchequer, quite regardless of this fact, professes confidence in the probity of the tenants and the value of the securities of all kinds on which the Chief Secretary relies, it is certainly reasonable to demand from the Government, on behalf of the Exchequer and the Irish and British taxpayers, such a system of administration as shall put the collection and transmission of the instalments of purchase on a sound basis. The Irish taxpayer is interested in this more directly and immediately than the British, as we have said; for he is pledged to the extent of the interest on £200,000,000, a sum of inestimable value in developing the industrial resources of the country as distinguished from the purely agricultural. We are not disparaging the Chief Secretary's great effort, we are not criticizing men who represented both landlord and tenants in a council of conciliation, but we insist that the success of the measure depends on the way it is worked, and it cannot be worked well by a board constituted like the one under the bill.

No doubt the measure would in any condition of affairs be administered by men specially appointed for the purpose, but the men should act in a department of State under the absolute control of an Irish government answerable to an Irish parliament. As the bill provides, the Commissioners shall be above all responsibility except to the Exchequer, and as long as the instalments are transmitted there will be no difficulty. But suppose the tenant-purchasers are unable to pay, what is to happen? We are not speaking of a strike against payment on the part of the tenant-purchasers; we are thinking of an honest inability to pay as the result of a bad season or a succession of bad seasons. In the bill of 1890-91 there was some elasticity, for time might be given for payment, but we search in vain for a discretionary power to grant time on the present measure. We do not say that such a power could be rightly bestowed on a mere board; we rather think it would be a mischievous and possibly

disastrous power in such hands; but such a power should be seated somewhere in the locality, and where, then, but in the executive of an Irish Parliament? This we think sufficiently clear.

There should be such a power, and in addition a power to make abatements, either temporary or permanent. Unless it be assumed that the Commissioners control the winds and the rains, and may send one of their officers to the storehouse of the snow with an injunction to restrain the officials there, there should be perfect elasticity of administration. As we said with regard to giving time, we say concerning the conferring of additional powers on a board in the present circumstances of Irish government and the utter ineffectiveness of Irish opinion, it would be mischievous or disastrous. It would lead to universal discontent and an agitation more furious than the Land League when Mr. Arthur Balfour described it as a "party violent in their designs to the verge of treason and unscrupulous in their methods beyond the limits of legality," and when he accuses them—in a passage hard to understand from a fair-minded man, but about which we shall say something—of looking on "social anarchy as the fitting prelude to Home Rule."

We do not exactly know if Mr. Balfour has changed this opinion, but undoubtedly only a few months ago a number of public men were in prison, and a respectable percentage of them was composed of members of Parliament. In addition to the powers of exceptional criminal statutes, one side in a purely trade quarrel exercised its undoubted right to institute civil proceedings. We pray our reader's attention to every line of this, as we have quoted the language of Mr. Balfour against the Land League¹² and the Home Rule movement. According to him there is no distinction between the two organizations, but his supporters in Ireland, the persons on whose representations he professed to rule the country, to advance whose interests financial, social and political war was made on three-fourths of the people, say there is a most marked distinction. They recognized the Home Rule movement as a perfectly legitimate but idle pursuit, an anachronism, a dream not unworthy of a sort of sympathetic pity, because of the unselfishness and idealism of its supporters, but about as practicable and useful as the restoration of the Heptarchy in England. Mr. Balfour himself at least impliedly drew a distinction between the Land League and the insurrectionary movements of 1848 and 1865 to the disadvantage of the

¹² The monstrous injustice of confounding a totally social movement, even though one of such immense consequences as that to change the ownership of a considerable part of the land of Ireland, with a purely political agitation like that to amend the legislative relations of the two countries, it would be hard to surpass.

former. He denounces the Land League as devoid of the high, self-sacrificing spirit of the '48 men and the men of '65, as animated by the basest and most sordid views, without scruple as to their means of reaching their ends of universal robbery and social triumph, and in stating such points of contrast he allowed it to be inferred that the young Irishmen and the Fenians were free from any guilt save that of treason, while the Land Leaguers and Home Rulers marched to objects lying on "the verge" of treason by every species of crime and outrage.

Yet to these men he surrendered in 1890-1 when he introduced a measure of Land Purchase and to the tenants who were the rank and file in that war of boycotting, of cattle maiming, of intimidation by every conceivable means, whether of social interdict or the midnight violence of armed and disguised bands making their rounds of terror from house to house of those who could not be relied upon to obey the decrees of the bog-side *vehmegericht*. What conclusion can be arrived at? Either Mr. Balfour in 1890-1 did not believe in the reality of the charges made by himself and others and investigated by what was called the Parnell Commission, or he himself and his party acted exactly as they had charged Mr. Gladstone with acting, that is, they surrendered to the forces of disorder and almost of treason, whose plan of action was to "make government in Ireland impossible" and render "social anarchy the fitting prelude to Home Rule."

What Mr. Balfour was as Irish Minister we find Mr. Wyndham to be, a man imprisoning the representatives of the people and large numbers of respectable men engaged in the furtherance of a trade agitation, and we must suppose both Ministers were doing all this through the purest motives. We are not disposed to enter into the controversy between Lord Penryhn and his miners, but we may draw some useful contrasts. These persons were the employer's servants or workmen and were paid wages for allotted work in the employer's mines, but the Irish tenants were joint owners with the landlord—this is the assertion which is the economic justification of Mr. Wyndham's bill—and were being deprived of their share of the joint property by the coöwner through a recourse to means perfectly legal. But who can say they were equitable under the circumstances? To take advantage of a bad harvest, say, or a disastrous fall in the price of black cattle or sheep that he might appropriate the share of his joint owner is hardly praiseworthy conduct on the part of the companion owner, and the owner acting thus not the one whom Paley¹³ would deem the meritorious one. Now, the miners of Lord Penryhn were not batoned by the police, the leading men among them were not sentenced to terms of hard labor. We

want to know why did not Mr. Wyndham leave Lord de Freyne and the other landlords behind him—the trade union of landlords—to fight their battles in the four Courts or at the Assizes instead of sending large forces of police and military, battering rams and ambulances—in fact, all that paraphernalia of eviction which used to cost so much and the saving of the cost of which henceforth is a prophetic part of the basis for the £200,000,000 to secure “the British taxpayers” against liability on account of paying the landlords the price of villa residences and grounds for their shadowy interest in partially reclaimed morasses round wretched dwellings, or the patches of herbage and potatoes in the spaces between the rocks in the neighborhood of Swineford or between the boulders on the inaccessible heights of the Galtees.¹⁴

In Mr. Gladstone's measure of 1886 the Irish Parliament were made the controlling authority and were allowed a bonus for the collection and transmission of the installments. There was the security of the Irish nation competent to pledge its credit and in addition enjoying the very considerable financial interest of £450,000 a year to maintain it. Instead we have a board powerless for any good purpose put at the head of the landed interest of Ireland, put over the grants returned to Ireland from the Imperial Exchequer for such local interests as education and lunatic asylums and put over a security for £200,000,000, and all this because the Chief Secretary and the Government would seem to prefer the failure of the so-called policy of conciliation and the loss of £112,000,000 to success along the whole line coupled by a measure of Home Rule. We say the stars in their courses are fighting for the national idea. The ineptitude of the scheme for administering a measure so vast in the amount involved and so far-reaching in its consequences—a bill which more than any previous land act goes down to the foundation of social disorder and economic difficulty, and to a large extent to the sources of political and religious discontent—the ineptitude of the scheme, we say, is the very presage of defeat from causes in no way connected with the probity of Irish tenants or the good will of the other classes.

We shall conclude this article with the practical question: is it sound policy to make the Imperial Exchequer an universal Irish landlord in the event of the purchasers being prevented by any causes from fulfilling their engagements? The consideration is one

¹³ We mean Pigeon Paley. We have been always impressed by the vividness of Paley's illustration, though, no doubt, small wits might laugh at it.

¹⁴ An English “assurance” company used to draw £20,000 a year from the “shielings” (a hut of wattles roofed with sods) and a few acres of rock above the clouds. Another English assurance company squeezed an enormous rent roll from the desert of Partry in Mayo.

pregnant with eventualities one dare not contemplate. For the success of his measure in part the Chief Secretary has decided on the reduction of the police force hitherto maintained as the means to cope with what interested men pretended to regard as the sole elements of disorder. If, on the other hand, there should stand an authority in Ireland sustained by the whole power of public opinion and anxious for its own sake to safeguard the Exchequer, no one can fail to see how certain must be the fulfilment of every engagement entered into by the nation. In such a case the whole country, even the recalcitrant section of the landlords included, would feel itself bound to preserve its credit at all costs and sacrifices; the whole country would then be the police. The future would depend upon the loyal correspondence of the native government with Imperial interests; the importance of winning the confidence of English capital would be a potent factor in the relations between both countries. Influences would be at work which no mere Board of Commissioners could command. Every effort would be strained by the Irish executive to compel dishonest purchasers to pay and every assistance would be given to enable honest ones, for whom circumstances had been too strong, to tide over their difficulties. A native legislature controlling such an executive alone could be the authority to bring about these results, and hence we say that this is the fulfilment of the policy begun by the scheme of Land Purchase.

GEORGE McDERMOT, C. S. P.

New York, N. Y.

THE "TWELFTH PROMISE."

SOME of our readers may perhaps have read the correspondence lately going on in the (London) *Tablet* occasioned by a short letter of the present writer on the subject of the Nine Fridays. It was not without a sense of weighty responsibility that the correspondence was begun, as it was only too clear that much of what would be said would occasion a devotional unsettlement in the minds of a few simple souls. Nor has this forecast proved false. Since the appearance of the letters to the *Tablet* I have been informed that A—— and B—— have given up devotion to the Sacred Heart. But in spite of the risk of an almost unavoidable "scandalum pusillorum," and in the only too keen realization of what it would mean

for souls whom it was hard to pain, I felt it a duty to make a protest merely in my own name and on my own responsibility against what I could only consider the abuse of the Twelfth Promise. The subject of the Twelfth Promise belongs to the liberty of the Sons of God; so that sides may be taken in the discussion without hurt to the conscience. Moreover, the speculative view of the history and theology of the Promise is not the only occasion of divergent opinions. Men may also part company in the view they hold of the means taken to popularize the promise. Some may think it both right and fit. Others may look upon it as unreal and—to use a theological word hard to put into English—"scandalosum." Some may hold that the present propaganda does nothing but good. Others, fully alive to the good done, may be no less alive to the mischief occasioned in the minds of the simpler members of the flock. And as those who think the propaganda of the promise to be right and fit are justified in giving vent to their views, so there can be no reason why those who have the full right to differ from them should not have the full right to publish the reasons for their difference. To say this—to say it strongly yet feelingly—to say it without sheltering oneself behind an anonymity—to say it in the full confidence that one has a right to say it—to say it under the painful feeling that to protest may be as great a duty as it is a right—to say it as prudently and as reverently as the difficulties of the subject will allow, may well be the one aim of a Catholic theologian in writing on the subject. Whilst such was his aim it would naturally be borne in upon him that certain souls would be inevitably pained, and even shocked at what he wrote. Yet he could not easily allow the responsibility of such pain to be laid at his own door. The greater part, if not the whole of such responsibility, he could only consistently lay to the door of those who were spreading or had spread the Twelfth Promise in such a way as to occasion a mistaken view of the grace of final perseverance. The blame, if any, he could only consistently attribute to those who had caused the wound, not to those who, like himself, did their best to cure it by first laying it bare.

These words of explanation, or, if you will, apology, need to be completed by an obvious remark. Discussion of the Twelfth Promise must not be mistaken for discouragement of the Nine Fridays. Writers in the *Tablet* again and again appeared anxious to defend the Nine Fridays by showing that the devotion did not lessen communions on Sundays and the greater feasts. Such a thesis will always be interesting; but it will always be a side issue. Moreover, it will be an issue which is probably as undemonstrable as it is accidental. How can it be proved or disproved? To whom

shall we appeal? Priests who encourage the devotion of the Nine Fridays can only consistently say that it does not interfere with Sunday and holy day communions; priests who discourage the devotion can only consistently say that it does. Shall we then appeal from opinions to statistics—from guess work to fact? By all means; if accurate statistics are to be found. But in matters like these where are such statistics to be found? Are not accurate numbers the hardest facts to come by? Memories are not always trustworthy, especially in regard to numbers, and more especially when men have a thesis to prove or disprove by their numbers. Shall we then appeal away from past numbers to future numbers? By all means; if the numbers are representative. But is it feasible to begin the keeping of statistics? Will not the intention defeat itself? No sooner is a proposal for keeping statistics mooted than a rise in Sunday communions will be the result. For these reasons, then, it will appear that the question of the influence of the Nine Fridays on Sunday and holy day communions must always practically remain a side issue, incapable of proof and disproof, and only akin to those general theses on which we practice our coming preachers or speakers in their debating clubs. So that to one who takes a broad philosophical view of evidence, if the question is put, "Do you hold that the Nine Friday devotion interferes with communion on Sundays and holy days?" the reply will be: "I do not know. Nor do I think that men will ever agree." No priest whose chief aim is to foster and safeguard his flock in the "liberty of the sons of God" will interfere with them if their bent leads them to make the First Fridays. He himself may wish to make the Fifteen Saturdays in honor of Our Lady. Doubtless he would look upon it as a hardship if his confessor meddled with this personal devotion. To be consistent, then, he must allow what he claims; "give and take" must be weighed in the same scales. He must not meddle with the personal bent of his penitent, unless indeed as the shepherd and doctor of souls he discovers that the strange fascination of numbers or a false view of the Twelfth Promise has misled them into material, if not formal, superstition. It will be seen that the only practical point of discussion is the Twelfth Promise. To confine a vast subject within natural bounds we shall deal with—I. The History of the Promise. II. The Propagation of the Promise. III. The Theology of the Promise.

THE HISTORY OF THE TWELFTH PROMISE.

Our readers may find it useful to have a chronological table:

1647. July 22, B. Margaret Mary born.

1674. First Revelation regarding the Sacred Heart.

1688. Letters to Mère de Saumaise regarding the Twelfth Promise.

1690. B. Margaret Mary dies.

1729. Bishop Languet's Life of Blessed Margaret Mary.

1864. Beatification of Blessed Margaret Mary.

1867. Text of Twelfth Promise first published.

1870. Propagation of Twelfth Promise begun.

It is not quite clear that we have the correct text of the Promise. Father Thurston gives the following: "One Friday during Holy Communion He said to His unworthy servant if she does not deceive herself, 'I promise thee in the excessive mercy of My Heart, that Its all-powerful love will grant to all those who communicate on nine consecutive First Fridays of the month the grace of final repentance; they shall not die in My disfavour nor without receiving their sacraments; for My divine Heart shall be their safe refuge in this last moment.'" (*Month*, June, 1903, p. 637.)

Father Thurston gives this version on the authority of Père Le Bachelet, S. J., *Études*, August 5, 1901. But whilst Père Le Bachelet, S. J., gives this text on the authority of the "*Vie et Œuvres de la Bienheureuse Marguerite*," etc., Paris, second edition, 1876, he adds what he calls the text itself (*texte même*), which differs in one striking particular from Father Thurston's text. In the foregoing text it is said that persons making the Nine Fridays "shall not die without receiving *their* sacraments;" but in this "*texte même*" of Père Le Bachelet it is said "without receiving *the* sacraments."

There is a third variant which we give on the authority of Bishop Languet. "She prescribed a practice for honoring the Heart of Jesus Christ which was familiar to her. Our Blessed Lord had suggested it to her, leading her to hope for the grace of final perseverance and of receiving *the sacraments of the Church before dying* for those who made use of the practice." (*Vie de la Venerable Mère M. M.*, Paris, 1830, II. e. part, p. 23.) Then follows mention of the Nine Fridays. It will be seen that this variant agrees with the second text in saying "*the* sacraments," whereas the first text says "*their* sacraments." Moreover, Bishop Languet simply says that Our Lord suggested the practice of the Nine Fridays "*en lui faisant espérer*," i. e., "in leading her to hope" for final perseverance. Those who are acquainted with the lives of mystical saints know how commonly these holy souls receive heavenly counsels in the choice of devotions for a happy death. To some of us it will doubtless appear that the revelation granted to Blessed Margaret Mary, if authentic, was of this nature. Strangely enough, this view of the Promise is borne out by three facts: 1. In Father Thurston's words, "Blessed Margaret Mary herself does not appear to have

attached any exceptional significance or importance" to the Promise. (*The Month*, June, 1903, p. 637.) 2. Bishop Lanquet speaks of a "practice which was *familiar to her*." It is strange that this practice, at once so familiar to the saint and stimulated by such an "astounding and precious promise" should be mentioned in only one letter, some two years before her death. 3. Moreover, it is remarkable that Blessed Margaret died without receiving the Last Sacraments.

The history of the letter to Mère de Saumaise which contains the promise is interesting to historical specialists. The various points likely to take their notice may be summarized from Father Thurston's admirable paper in *The Month*.

1. "The autograph text of the letter . . . to Mère de Saumaise . . . (is) now no longer in existence."

2. There are "three early copies of the letter. . . . One is certainly older than 1714. A second is most probably older still, while a third is more ancient than either of the others."

3. "With regard to the few words of the promise which alone concern us here the differences of reading are of the most trivial nature."

4. "In an article which appeared last year in the *Études* Père Hamon called attention to the extraordinary license which all the saint's contemporaries permitted themselves in editing whatever proceeded from her pen. . . . Those who prepared her letters for the public eye considered themselves justified in taking every kind of liberty with regard to the phraseology, . . . and so expressions were altered and toned down or occasionally omitted, until it is sometimes hardly possible to recognize the phraseology of the Blessed Margaret Mary at all. . . . When one realizes the complete absence of literary conscience which such a process implies one is tempted at the first blush to think that with editors who so little respected the text they were dealing with, almost any perversion was possible." (Perhaps on the death of Blessed Margaret Mary without the last sacraments, this "absence of literary conscience" will account for the fact that some texts read "without *the* sacraments," whilst others read "without *their* sacraments.")

A last stage in the history of the Promise was reached when her cause of beatification was introduced. In 1843 the Great Promise was formally objected to by the *Advocatus Diaboli*. The following facts, taken from Father Thurston's article in the *Month* will serve to give readers an outline of the matter.

1. "The reply of Mgr. Arnaldi, the Postulator Causæ is to the effect that all such promises are understood to be based upon the implied condition that God's law is kept. They amount to no more than an assurance of special graces" (p. 638).

2. "Mgr. Arnaldi is careful to include the introductory qualification, 'He said to His unworthy servant, if she does not deceive herself,' which had been omitted in his opponent's objection" (p. 639.)

3. There is no mention of the Twelfth Promise in the Bull of Beatification. It has been urged that there is no mention of the Rosary in the Bull of Canonization of St. Dominic. The cases are not parallel. Because no one, to my knowledge, has ever held that the question of the Rosary was discussed previous to canonization; the Twelfth Promise was discussed, and there is a strong Papal tradition in favor of the Rosary; there is no Papal tradition in favor of the Twelfth Promise.

4. It has been argued that the qualification "if I do not deceive myself" means nothing in the mouth of Blessed Margaret Mary, because Mère de Greyfie had wished her to add it when speaking of her extraordinary graces. But to some of us it would seem unlikely that a saint could feign uncertainty when she was quite certain of a fact—especially in the case of a Promise which is reputed so "astounding and precious." Father Thurston writes: "It must be remarked that we do not invariably find this note of doubt in the saint's descriptions of her supernatural experiences, especially when we are dealing with her own autographs" (p. 637). When the *Advocatus Diaboli* omitted this phrase the Postulator *Causæ* took care to put it in.

We may summarize the history of the Twelfth Promise as follows: It is recorded that Our Blessed Lord made a promise—a "precious and astonishing promise"—to Blessed Margaret Mary, "to which she does not appear to have attached any exceptional significance or importance;" which she prefaces with the phrase "if I do not deceive myself;" of which the autograph is lost; of which three copies remain, all differing in certain ("trivial:" Thurston) phrases, in company with other letters, etc., so handled as to be almost beyond recognition, and that the first reference to the Nine Fridays is in Bishop Languet's book some forty years after the promise; that this reference does not coincide with the promise as commonly propagated; that the promise was submitted to Rome before the saint's beatification; that the Postulator *Causæ* took it to mean no more than an assurance of special graces; that he took care to add the distinctive formulary "if I do not deceive myself," which is not always found in the account of her revelations, especially in her autographs; that the Bull of her beatification contains no mention of this revealed promise, though it contains a reference to her other visions—which were equally examined—and that the fact of her having said that she received this promise "if I do not deceive myself" was no bar to her beatification.

THE PROPAGATION OF THE TWELFTH PROMISE.

A few preliminary remarks may be set down: "Considered in itself Devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus is independent of the promises made to the Blessed Margaret Mary. This is a truth which it would be useless to prove." (Le Bachelet, S. J. *Études*; reprinted in "*Le Messager du Cœur de Jésus*," Toulouse, Oct., 1902, p. 608).

"Most of the vogue which attaches in the popular mind to the First Friday Communion is due to the famous promise believed to have been made by Our Lord to Blessed Margaret Mary in 1688. (Father Thurston, p. 636.)

The Twelfth Promise "is treated by some with a kind of avoidance or of vague mistrust." (Le Bachelet, p. 608.)

We may now go on to give an account of the Propagation of the Promise.

1. "The text of the Blessed Margaret Mary's letter" (i. e., the Twelfth Promise) "was first printed in 1867." (Thurston, p. 636.)

2. In the older Manuals of the Sacred Heart we find eleven promises in the concise form and in the same order they have still kept. For a long time in the majority of leaflets no other promises were printed.* It was not until 1870, when devotion to the Sacred Heart received such a new stimulus in France that a twelfth was added" (Le Bachelet, p. 610). "Since then the most extraordinary development has taken place in the First Friday Communions (Thurston, p. 636). Père le Bachelet reminds us of the outburst of devotion to the Sacred Heart in France caused by the Franco-Prussian war in 1870. Such a period of national stress is likely to give rise to new fervor not merely in devotional practices but even in devotional excesses. During the great schism in the fifteenth century it is painful to contrast the quiet reformation wrought by the Brethren of the Common Life with the destruction wrought by the errors of Wyclif and the false prophecies of Telesphorus. The noble enthusiasm which began the Basilica of Montmartre in the day

* There are *fourteen* promises set down in a little book entitled "Promises Made by Our Lord Jesus Christ to Blessed Margaret Mary," translated from the French, Montreuil-sur-Mer, 1894. I quote the last three promises (capitals as in original):

"XII. THOSE WHO SHALL BE DEVOTED AND CONSECRATED TO THIS DIVINE HEART SHALL NEVER PERISH.

"XIII. THOSE WHO RECEIVE COMMUNION ON THE FIRST FRIDAY OF NINE CONSECUTIVE MONTHS SHALL HAVE A HAPPY DEATH.

"XIV. THE SACRED HEART OF JESUS SHALL REIGN."

A correspondent, under the anonym R. L. I. N., writing in the *Tablet*, June 27, 1903, says that the book is "written by Father de Franciosi, S. J. . . . The work is a learned treatise on devotion to the Sacred Heart and has the imprimatur of the Provincial."

of France's humiliation was not necessarily exempt from the universal law of corruption which overshadows the best instincts and perverts the purest devotions.

3. The propagation of the Twelfth Promise is carried on by every literary means from the unauthorized pious picture to the "learned treatise." A picture of this sort, most artistically printed by Bouasse Lebel, Paris, was the occasion of the present writer taking the matter in hand. It contained the Twelve Promises—the twelfth in the following form: "To those who communicate (sic) the First Friday of the month for nine consecutive months I promise the grace of final repentance; they shall not die in My disfavour, nor without receiving *the sacraments*, and My Heart shall be their refuge at that last hour." I called this promise "scandalous." I did not say untrue, because the truth preached untimely may scandalize the weaker brethren. In a further letter I explained that I attached the note of "scandalous" not to the promise in itself, as it was supposed to come from Our Blessed Lord, but as sometimes propagated.

Another form of this propagation is exemplified in "The Little Treasury of Leaflets," M. & S. Eaton, Dublin. "I promise thee in the excess of the mercy of My Heart that its all-powerful love will grant to all those who receive Communion on the First Friday of every month for nine consecutive months, *the grace of final repentance* and that they shall *not die under My displeasure* nor without receiving the sacraments, and My Heart shall be their secure refuge at that last hour.

"This last astonishing and precious promise is found twice in 'The Life of the Blessed Margaret Mary,' written by her contemporaries and transcribed by them from her own autograph letters.

"It must be remembered, however, that the Communion must be offered on the First Friday. The following will not suffice for it. Moreover, if this novena be, for any reason, interrupted we must begin it again.

"Tell this to your neighbor, or send for more copies of these papers and spread them." (Vol. I., No. 35.)

Not all the pious pictures contain the Twelfth Promise. I have a most artistic picture by Blanchard of Orleans with only eleven promises, the Twelfth being omitted.

The little book, "the learned treatise," as the writer in the *Tablet* calls it, of Father de Franciosi, S. J., has been mentioned before. As the author gives *fourteen* promises the Twelfth Promise becomes the thirteenth: "Those who receive Communion on the First Friday of nine consecutive months shall have a happy death. . . . These expressions are very clear. . . . The real text has been

laid aside for want of space. . . . Moreover, even where her own words have been kept, they are reduced to the shortest extracts from her writings, and these cannot fail to lose much by being isolated from their context. . . . N. B.—The words *it seems to me, if I mistake not*, and other such expressions often made use of by Blessed Margaret Mary in quoting the words of Our Divine Lord, are the fruit of her humility and in no way imply a doubt on her part as to the reality or the nature of the communication with which she was favoured.” (Ut supra, pp. 7-9.)

A more exhaustive account must be given of a pamphlet printed at St. Joseph's College Press, Trichinopoly, 1898, with the imprimatur of Joannes Maria, S. J., Bishop of Trichinopoly. It begins as follows: “With the kind permission of the Rev. Father J. Wynne, S. J., editor of the *American Messenger of the Sacred Heart*, the following pages on the Twelfth Promise are reprinted from its February number, 1898.

“It is our opinion, shared by men whom we look upon as good judges in the matter, that of all the explanations we have read till now this is by far the most exhaustive. . . . Though its author modestly proposes it only as highly probable, it seems to us it entirely justifies the hope generally entertained by persons who perform the devotion of the Nine First Fridays.”

In the book itself the writer in the *American Messenger* gives the usual form of the Promise, making use of the phrase “leues sacraments” (their sacraments) not “les sacraments” (*the* sacraments). Some passages may be culled from it.

I. “It is not our intention to treat of the authenticity of this Promise. We may say, however, that it would be very risky to call its authenticity in question, since it is found in the writings of Blessed Margaret Mary, which have passed the scrutiny of the Roman Congregation” (p. 9).

Compare this with Father Thurston, who says that even after the examination and beatification, “None the less, the question of the authenticity of the revelation is left untouched” (p. 639). Also Benedict XIV.: “It follows then that any one may without injury to the Catholic faith give no heed to these revelations and differ from them.” (De Beat. and Canon., London, Eng., Trans., Vol. III., p. 397.)

II. The writer gives three explanations of the Promise. The first is that of the famous Père Ramiere: “That in it we have only a guarantee of more than ordinary help at the hour of death” (p. 10). (This would also seem the meaning put upon it by the Postulator Causæ, when forwarding the cause of beatification.) “Our Lord . . . promises extra help, not salvation. He holds out the cer-

tainty of extraordinary favours at the hour of death. He gives no certainty of final repentance" (p. 11). *This opinion is rejected.*

The second opinion is that of "a learned writer in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, Nov., 1890. . . . This Promise stands on a level with many other promises which we frequently meet in Sacred Writ. 'Alms delivereth from death' (Job xii., 9). 'He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood shall have everlasting life' (St. John vi., 55). . . . It does not give certainty of salvation. . . . It seems to us the second explanation does not differ substantially from the first" (pp. 12, 13). *This opinion is likewise rejected.*

The third opinion is that of the writer himself, which we shall give in his own words.

III. "The third explanation insists on taking the words of the great Promise in their plain and obvious sense (p. 13). The grace of a good death is held out absolutely to all who worthily perform the Devotion of the Nine Fridays.

"If any of those who have performed this Devotion fall into mortal sin they shall receive the efficacious grace of repentance before death.

"If they do not receive the efficacious grace of *perfect contrition* they may be sure of receiving whatever sacrament is necessary for their reconciliation."

These great blessings, however, are not held out as the reward of any merit acquired by fulfilling the conditions of the Promise. Neither do they seem to be offered as the infallible object of this Devotion in so far as it is a prayer.

"The blessings of which there is question are granted as a pure gift of the Sacred Heart. The Nine Communions are but the condition under which this gift is offered" (pp. 29, 30).

IV. He then goes on to put an obvious objection founded on Our Blessed Lord's promise. The words of the writer are as follows :

Objection. "But is not the Promise made to Blessed Margaret Mary to be interpreted after the same manner as the Promise in John vi., 52, 'If any one eat of this bread, he shall live forever?'"

Reply. ". . . the Great Promise does insure to him an *efficacious* grace wherewith he shall *unfailingly*, though with full liberty, perform whatever may be necessary for salvation" (p. 26). "Does not the grace of 'final repentance' imply that we shall have, to some extent at least, nullified the effect of those Communions by our sins? And still that grace is promised. Nor will it suffice to say that this grace is only a *sufficient* one—very special, no doubt—very powerful—but still only sufficient. For not only is it a grace coming from the excess of Christ's mercy, but is a grace of such a kind that none of those who receive it 'shall die in Christ's disfavor.'

"We are not to restrict the Promise made to Blessed Margaret Mary in the same way as we are obliged both by Scripture and Tradition to restrict the Promise made in the Gospel of St. John, for the two promises are not parallel. In the Gospel the promise is general; our Lord does not prescribe when or how often the Sacrament of His Body is to be received. In the Great Promise He lays down the exact number of times and the exact days on which we are to receive Him. Is it not likely that He also lays down the exact result?" (Pp, 27, 28.) A well-known and highly respected ecclesiastic who sends me this book calls it "incredibly unreal."

A Canon Diocesan Inspector sends me a leaflet with the words, "You may be glad to add the enclosed to your collection of unauthorized promises." The leaflet is entitled "The Twentieth Century and the Sacred Heart." At the head of the page, in red letters, are written the words, "I will grant the grace of final penitence to those who receive Holy Communion on the First Fridays of nine consecutive months." In the body of the pamphlet are the words, "There is a homage which a great number of the faithful could easily render to Our Lord, a homage He has claimed as being very agreeable to His Heart and one He has consecrated and encouraged by the promise of eternal salvation. It is Communion on the First Friday of nine consecutive months.

"Holy Church has adopted and blessed this practice." The writer's name is Stephen Coubé, S. J. There is no imprimatur.

To sum up: I have received private letters enough from Provosts, Monsignors, Deans, Diocesan Inspectors and Parish Priests to show that there is a widespread dislike of the method of propagating the Twelfth Promise. Nor can we be surprised if the simple faithful on reading the books I have summarized above are led into material, I will not say formal, superstition. It was for this reason that I have all along used the formal word scandalous. That scandal has been given by these books—these popular books, not erudite theological treatises—the private letters I have received from England, Ireland, Belgium and America sufficiently prove. Only a few days ago I received the following from a convert priest, who received his theological training in Rome:

"Will you allow me to say that I am very grateful to you for having opened the question of the Nine First Fridays? In my mission I encourage the First Friday Communion and have told the faithful of the Plenary Indulgence granted to those who, on those days, after Confession and Communion meditate for a while on the infinite goodness of the Sacred Heart; but two curious facts have come under my notice: 1. A young girl in my mission who would not miss a First Friday Communion for anything did not go to Holy

Communion on the Feast of Pentecost or on the Feast of the Sacred Heart, and (b) my housekeeper gravely informed me that she was quite certain she should have the Last Sacraments at her death, because she had made the Nine Fridays."

THE THEOLOGY OF THE TWELFTH PROMISE.

Under this heading there are many points to be examined bristling with difficulty. We shall treat of two (a) What can be said of the Promise itself? and (b) What can be said of the examination of the Promise made before the beatification of the saint?

(a). The Council of Trent says: "*Si quis magnum illud usque in finem perseverantiæ donum se certo habiturum absoluta certitudine dixerit; nisi hoc ex speciali revelatione dixerit anathema sit.*" (Sess. Vi., Can. XVI. de Justif.)"

There would seem no doubt that Almighty God could promise final perseverance as a reward for the Nine First Fridays, though it is often useless and not seldom irreverent to question the possibilities of Omnipotence. However, the "Promissiones Christi," for which the Church so often prays to be made worthy, are part of the great Deposit of Faith, treasured up in Scripture and Tradition. To those great Promises the course of ages brings no new Promise. To say, as a writer quoted above says, that the Twelfth Promise "goes further" than the solemn Promise in St. John's Gospel gives great perplexity to those of us who shrink from strong but justifiable protest. Speaking only for myself I say that such a phrase is "scandalous," *i. e.*, calculated to lead simple souls into material superstition.

The Theology of the Twelfth Promise is certainly, perhaps unavoidably, complicated by the so-called Sabbatine Indulgence of the Brown Scapular. But we may remark that just as theologians have been warm in defending this Indulgence, so have other theologians been equally earnest in attacking it. If Benedict XIV. is on the side of its authenticity, Papebrock and Lauroy are against its authenticity. Perhaps it may one day be condemned as spurious. For myself I hold no side. But I would venture to suggest that there is no complete parallel between the Sabbatine Indulgence and the Twelfth Promise. In the former case final perseverance is granted to one who wears a scapular, *i. e.*, who makes an act of faith, until death; in the latter case final perseverance is granted to one who may have performed an exercise fifty years before death and may have lived meanwhile in mortal sin. The Sabbatine Indulgence has something to go upon in the present act of faith; the Twelfth Promise has nothing to go upon in the past act of faith. Even if the Sabbatine Indulgence were admitted as theologically

possible, the Twelfth Promise would not necessarily be admitted as possible. The onus of proving the parity between them would lie upon the patrons of the Twelfth promise, and not upon its questioners. Nor will the words "final repentance" allow them to employ a common means of defense. When the Twelfth Promise is defended stress is laid on the Nine Fridays; when the Promise has to be defended stress is laid on a "Good Life."

With regard to visions dealing with an assurance of predestination or reprobation, St. Francis of Sales declares that they are specially open to suspicion (*Œuvres*, Vol. XIII., Edit. 1831. *Lettres* Bk. II., Ep. 23). Amort, so prized by St. Alphonsus and Benedict XIV., bluntly writes: "Revelationes autem omnes in quibus certa opera peragentibus, vel certa scapularia gestantibus vel certas orationes recitantibus promittitur conversio in articulo mortis, sunt somnia mulibria ex illusionem dacamonum, and prohibentur a sacra Congr. Indicis. prout patet ex Indice Romae Edit o 1753." (*Ethica Christiana*, 1758, p. 270. Though Father Thurston cannot find this decision of the Index.

If ever the question of the Sabbatine Indulgence and the Twelfth Promise is decided on purely theological grounds, it may not be hazardous to forecast that the decision will follow from two principles of St. Thomas, one regarding the Deposit of Faith, the other regarding the Grace of Final Perseverance. In the 2a. 2ae., 174, 6 3m. he lays down the principle that private revelations can add nothing to Revelation. In the 1a. 2ae., 112, 9 he lays down the principle that the grace of final perseverance cannot be merited. For the moment all theologians of note are agreed that the free-will of man cannot merit this grace "de condigno," though some are inclined to think that it can merit the grace "de congruo."

(b). What can be said of the examination of the Promise which was made previous to the saint's beatification?

1. Beatification is, roughly speaking, a declaration of the heroicity of a saint's virtues, i. e., Faith, Hope, Charity and the Four Cardinal Virtues. It is evident that even the heroic virtue of the greatest saints is compatible with venial imperfections. It is especially evident that heroic faith may be quite compatible with certain unwitting errors with regard to the doctrines of faith, still more with regard to private revelations or supernatural manifestations. In these matters of faith the Church asks chiefly if the subject for beatification or canonization has been obstinate in holding his own opinions, or if he has been willing to submit them to the decision of the Church. The best may blunder. It is not error but headstrongness that makes the heretic. If the writings of the candidate for canonization contain innocent mistakes this would be no permanent

bar to his canonization. It would be very difficult to reconcile all the writings of all canonized saints. In the case of Blessed Margaret Mary the Promoter of the Cause seems to have felt the importance of this. We are told that the "Advocatus Diaboli" omitted the restrictive phrase "if I do not deceive myself," and that the Postulator took care to make good the omission. In the case of a private revelation like that of Blessed Margaret Mary, the examination proves that there was no bar to beatification in her (conditional) way of holding the revelation. It cannot be made to prove that the revelation itself was authentic.

2. Some few extracts from Benedict XIV. ("De Beat. and Canon." SS. English Tr. London, 1852, Vol III.) may be found useful. "What is to be said of those private revelations which the Apostolic See has approved of, those of the Blessed Hildegard, of St. Bridget and of St. Catharine of Siena? We have already said that those revelations, although approved, ought not to, and cannot, receive from us any assent of Catholic, but only of human, faith, according to the rules of prudence, according to which the aforesaid revelations are probable and piously to be believed" (p. 395).

". . . It follows, then, that any one may without injury to the Catholic faith give no heed to these revelations and differ from them" (p. 397).

"When some years ago they were discussing at Rome the resumption of the cause, Tirasone, that is, that of the beatification and canonization of the venerable servant of God Sister Mary a Jesu de agreda and her revelations were to be examined, the theologians of the seraphic religion and the Postulator of the Cause published a book at the Papal press in 1730 in which we read: 'Theologians and mystics acknowledge that private revelations, however approved and received, although they ought to be believed by those to whom they are given, among others the opposite' (speaking of the opinions which are adverse to those revelations) 'retain the same probability which they had before the revelation.'

"Hurtado after reciting the approbation of the revelations of St. Bridget by the Sovereign Pontiffs, speaks as follows: 'It is not the meaning of these Supreme Pontiffs that we may not dissen from these revelations' (397, 398).

"The sixth question is, whether a saint may have revelations, not from the Holy Spirit, but resulting from his own individual judgment and reasonings, so far as his intellect, influenced by pious dispositions and imbued with opinions on any subject connected with religion, judge that he has the divine spirit. When, however, he is in invincible error." . . . (Reply) "It may happen that a saint may think from pre-conceived opinions and from fixed ideas

in the imagination that certain things are revealed to him by God, which yet God does not reveal" (402, 403).

I shall add a few words to sum up this third division of my paper and with it the whole of what I have written. To use a phrase of Father Thurston's, the beatification of the saint leaves the question of the authenticity of the Promise "untouched." The question of the theological possibility of such a promise is equally untouched. It may be decided in years to come that such a promise is spurious because impossible. That form of the Promise which includes the reception of *the* last sacraments is evidently impossible in its literal interpretation, seeing that numbers have died after the Nine Fridays without the sacraments, of whom the first was Blessed Margaret Mary herself. Were I to make a personal confession I should say that to my unhistorical mind it seems historically more probable that a revelation was made to the saint, though I do not pretend to think the evidence faultless or complete. But it seems to me that the promise is no more than has been made to many other saints. It is another form of publishing God's mercifulness of heart. It is but a repetition of the "Promissiones Christi" enshrined in Scripture and Tradition. It cannot go "further" than the Gospel Promise. To lay great stress upon it, to make it the great motive for First Friday Communions, to publish it without note or comment, to summarize it by promising a "Happy Death," to dwell upon the authenticity of it, to take views of it which are not sanctioned by the explanation of the Postulator Causæ, to make little of the saint's humble and wise formula, "If I do not deceive myself," to seem to accept it in its literal form, and in this guise to spread it abroad everywhere by book and pamphlet and tract and pious picture, is in my poor humble opinion to give occasion to material superstition.

VINCENT McNABB, O. P.

Woodchester, Gloucester, England,

A FATAL ERROR IN EDUCATION AND ITS REMEDY.

THE question of religious instruction in the public schools, which has been agitated in this country for more than fifty years, seems to have engaged the attention of educators particularly during the past year. The most animated and most interesting discussion of the last meeting of the National Educational Association held at Boston, July, 1903, was that on religious

instruction in the public schools. A few months previous, at a great convention of educators and clergymen at Chicago, a National Organization for the Improvement of Religious Education was founded. The plan of this organization had been proposed in the *Biblical World*, November, 1902. A leading article of this review, said to be inspired by its editor, President Harper, of the University of Chicago, declares that "it has become increasingly clear that the instruction of the young in religion and morality, which is given in the Sunday school, the home and by other means, is inadequate to the present need. . . . For the past twenty-five years there has been a growing recognition of the unsatisfactoriness of the existing conditions." This is one of the many recent utterances of non-Catholics who begin to admit the constant claim of Catholics, namely, that a system of schools which fails to teach religion is defective, nay, dangerous to the welfare of society and the State. They concede, explicitly or implicitly, that the exclusion of religious teaching from the public schools is one of the greatest blunders that have been made in this country. Catholics have all along objected to a system of education which excludes all religious teaching; for decades they have been assailed for their conscientious attitude in this momentous question and have even been charged with hostility to the republic. At last this outrageous calumny is repudiated even by Protestants. To quote one instance among many, Professor Coe, of the Northwestern University, said in January of this year in a lecture delivered in Chicago: "The position of Roman Catholics in regard to religion and education and their policy in the establishment of parochial schools are absolutely correct." The number of those Protestants who advocate the introduction of some sort of religious teaching in the schools is increasing every day. However, many non-Catholic educators still proclaim that it is either unnecessary, or unadvisable, or even impossible to teach religion in the public schools. Thus at the recent convention of the National Educational Association no less a man than the United States Commissioner of Education, Dr. Harris, declared that religious instruction should be confined to the church and that it should be divorced entirely from the public schools.¹ It is true, many members of the convention remonstrated vigorously against this view, but not a few defended it with equal vigor. Mr. J. M. Greenwood, Superintendent of Schools, Kansas City, stated: "As the separation of State and Church is a fundamental principle of our government, Church and school should be kept always separate."

The defenders of this view hold that religious instruction, neces-

¹ *Boston Evening Transcript*, July 7, 1903.

sary as it is, can sufficiently be imparted in the family and by the Church in the Sunday school. Indeed, the *family* is a powerful factor in the religious education of the young—provided the family life is truly religious. But what is the actual state of affairs? Thousands of families are pervaded by a spirit of utter religious indifference, and the consequence is that tens of thousands of children hear absolutely nothing about religion at home and learn not even a short prayer in the family circle. Should not the school, the most highly organized, and consequently most powerful, educational institution make up for this deficiency as well as for deficiency in other instruction? For why are children sent to school at all? If all parents were able and willing to impart all necessary information to their children, there would be no need of schools. But schools are necessary because parents do not give, and in most cases cannot give, that secular instruction which is requisite for the welfare of the children and the community. Should not the school supply that instruction which is far more necessary for the individual and society and which is actually not given in the home, namely, religious instruction?

However, the objection is raised that it is the duty of the Church to teach religion. In very truth it is. But in order to fulfil this sacred duty the Church must have that influence on the education of the young which is hers by human and divine right. She should not be excluded from the school; she should have a share in the school hours to teach the children of her denomination the truths of religion, as is done in the schools of Germany, Holland and other European countries, and as is being done at last in England. But how and where is the Church to fulfil her duty when, as in this country, all influence on the public school system is jealously warded off? We are told: in the *Sunday school*. This is the solution of the great and important problem offered by many people in this country. The experiment has been tried for years, but with what success? Let us listen to Protestant authorities. A few years ago the *Congregationalist*, one of the ablest Protestant papers in the country, observed: "The contrast between the work done by the Roman Catholics for the children of this country and that done by the much larger body of Protestants ought to set us thinking whether our Sunday schools meet the need of the children for training in the knowledge of God and of their duty to Him." The *Biblical World* has of late frequently emphasized the insufficiency of the Sunday school to impart a thorough religious and moral training. Thus we read: "Is this primary mission [of teaching religion and morals] being adequately performed through the Sunday school and the home? It has been so assumed, but each passing year shows more

clearly that this is not the case. Further, there is a growing judgment of Christian people that adequate instruction in religion and morality cannot be given in the Sunday school and home alone. The home no longer feels the necessary responsibility, and the Sunday school has neither the time nor the instrumentalities for adequate instruction. . . . Since only a limited number of children attend Sunday school, or live in homes where real religion and morality are found, it has resulted that the *great majority* of children have been growing up without essential religious and ethical education."² This is the reason why the Sunday school is unable to impart efficient religious and moral training: relatively few attend Sunday school, and, even if all attended, the time allotted is totally inadequate. We may still add another consideration. Will children sufficiently respect and cherish a "branch of study" which is excluded from the regular curriculum and for which any spare time is good enough? Further, is it the proper condition if twenty to thirty hours are weekly devoted to the teaching of spelling, arithmetic, and the like, and one hour to the teaching of the "one thing necessary," religion and morality? Well has the Right Reverend Bishop of Trenton said: "We shall be told: Teach religion in your churches. No one, I presume, will accuse Catholics of neglect in this matter, and yet we are satisfied that such teaching alone is insufficient."³

In the present paper we are not concerned with those who wish all religious teaching to be relegated to the home and the church, but rather with those who advocate some kind or other of religious instruction in the schools. The great difficulty which confronts these educators is the method to be adopted and the extent to which religion may be taught in schools frequented by children of various denominations. Here many Protestants commit a serious error in advocating a system which is both inefficient and harmful. They want religion to be taught, but this teaching must be "unsectarian, undenominational," one that will suit every one and offend none. Thus Mr. Brooks, of Texas, in the recent convention of the National Educational Association, argued for a religious training in the schools "which should be satisfactory and common to all denominations."⁴ Other members of the convention advanced similar views. The proposition is in no way a new one; it has been ventilated in this country for more than fifty years in nearly every meeting of educators that entered upon the question of religious training of youth. At times the scheme is presented in different garb, under

² *Biblical World*, October, 1902.

³ *North American Review*, September, 1900.

⁴ *Boston Evening Transcript*, July 7, 1903.

other names, but in reality it is always the same. As an instance we may quote President Jesse, of the Missouri State University, who told the pupils of the Central High School of Kansas City in 1901 that religion should be taught in all the public schools, from the ward schools to the high schools; however, he would not have any sectarianism, but "the basis of Christian teaching as an object of study."⁵ We might as well expect protection against a blizzard from the "basis" of a house. No, the complete edifice is needed to afford protection. The study of the "basis" of Christian teaching will never safeguard youth in the storms of life. The complete system of Christian doctrine must be taught and inculcated in the youthful minds. Attempts at teaching unsectarian, undenominational religion have been justly ridiculed by earnest Protestants. Lord Salisbury, the English statesman, said of it: "Numbers of persons have invented what I may call a patent, compressible religion which can be forced into all consciences with a little squeezing; and they wish to insist that this should be the only religion taught throughout the schools of the nation."⁶

In the recent animated controversy on religious teaching in England, Mr. Storey, a Nonconformist, observed: "Neither the State nor the Churches themselves can invent an undenominational Christianity. It seems to have been imagined by certain people that the Christian religion is of the nature of a fancy cake, uniform and homogeneous at the bottom, but blossoming into distinct denominational bonbons at the top; and that while some persons might prefer the green sugarplum, and others the red, all alike would be willing to partake of the lower portions. It is an illusory and misleading metaphor. The religious difference between the Anglican and the Nonconformist is not a difference that emerges only in advanced elaborations of doctrine; it starts in the roots and the rudiments. There is no 'average' Christianity, but three or four generic interpretations differing more or less from one another, and differing to that extent throughout."⁷

Indeed, this unsectarian teaching of religion fully deserves the unsparing criticism and ridicule with which it has been branded by many writers. It is based on the false assumption that all religions are equally true, or that the different tenets held by all religious sects can be reduced to a common denominator of truth, or separated like skimmed milk from the cream so as to leave an unsectarian residuum of religion to which none of the numerous sects can object. Such a theory is a stupendous delusion and imposture. What could

⁵ *The St. Louis Globe-Democrat*, May 18, 1901.

⁶ *Fortnightly Review*, May, 1896.

⁷ *London Tablet*, July 19, 1902.

be left if this theory were carried out consistently? There is not a single truth of Divine revelation, not even the Divinity of Christ and His redemption, which is not denied by one or the other sect.⁸ To state it briefly: there is no undenominational religion, and that colorless and "boiled down" religion which would be the result of unsectarian teaching is neither Christianity nor any other religion whatsoever. It is as contemptible to the infidel as it is objectionable to the earnest believer. Above all, it will never produce the salutary results expected from religious teaching for strengthening the morality of the young. It has no more educational value than that "æsthetic" or "humanitarian" religion which abounds in lofty sentiment, but lacks the sure foundation of dogma. We may well quote in this connection the words of Dr. McCosh, of Princeton: "There are fathers shuddering at the thought of bringing up their sons to such a creed, or, rather, negation of creed: they have fears that its gossamer threads will not restrain the youth when flesh and blood are strong and temptations are in the way. Mothers are not sure that the faith expounded will stay and support their daughters and keep them from rushing into and running round the giddy whirls of pleasure, in which they are certain to become dizzy and fall."⁹

Catholics will never consent to any such mutilated system of religious instruction. They have special reasons for suspecting the "unsectarian" teaching of religion. Many years ago the Anglican Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Whateley, wrote in a private letter: "The education given by the National Board is gradually undermining the vast fabric of the Irish Roman Catholic Church. *If we give up mixed education we give up the only hope of weaning the Irish from Popery.*"¹⁰ Truly weighty words, worthy of being remembered by Catholics in every land who have to fight for the Catholic education of their children. It will also be easy to understand why a Roman Congregation told Catholics a few years ago that "it would be much safer in mixed schools to have only secular subjects of instruction taught than that the articles of faith common to all should be given in a maimed form." As matters are, the Catholics will be the first and heaviest losers; but, let it be understood, the Protestants will gain little. Such education will indeed wean the children from Popery, but it will not make sincere Protestants of them. They will turn infidels or swell the crowd of the religiously indifferent. Hence we cannot help designating this scheme of

⁸ See the letters of the Right Rev. Bishop of Salford in the *Tablet*, October 25 and November 1, 1902.

⁹ "Christianity and Positivism." Lecture VI., "Rationalism in America; Boston Theology."

¹⁰ The *Month* (London), November, 1897.

"religious" instruction as a dangerous and pernicious experiment; it is nothing but "casting out devils by Beelzebub."

We now come to a solution of the religious problem which has always figured conspicuously in educational and religious discussions in this country, but which has never been debated as keenly as within the last few years, and we may say within the last months. Thus the *Biblical World* (October and November, 1902), after having deplored the serious losses which have resulted from the total exclusion of religious teaching from the schools, advocates the reading of the Bible as the remedy. A few months ago Mr. Skinner, State Superintendent of Public Instruction in the State of New York, recognizing the inadequacy of a school system which eliminates religious training entirely, sent a report to the New York Legislature in which he said that he would not stop the reading of the Bible in the schools, although his predecessors had declared such a practice to be a violation of the Constitution. All he wanted to insist on was that no sectarian teaching accompanied the reading of the Bible.¹¹ In general, whenever Protestants advocate religious instructions in schools they say: "Read the Bible to the children." At times we hear even that some are very indignant at finding that Catholics protest against this scheme. A few reflections, however, will convince any unprejudiced mind that the Catholic position is entirely correct, and that the proposed reading of the Bible is not a sufficient means of inculcating the religious knowledge so sorely needed in the education of youth.

Before attempting to prove these propositions we can eliminate from our discussion one method of reading the Bible which has of late repeatedly been advocated. It has been proposed to restore the Bible to the schools as *literature*. A resolution to this effect has been adopted by the National Educational Association that met at Minneapolis in the summer of 1902: "It is apparent that familiarity with the English Bible as a masterpiece of literature is rapidly decreasing among the pupils in our schools. This is the direct result of a conception which regards the Bible as a theological book merely, and thereby leads to its exclusion from the schools of some States as a subject of reading and study. We hope and ask for such a change of public sentiment in this regard as will permit and encourage the English Bible to be read and studied as a literary work of the highest and purest type side by side with the poetry and prose which it has inspired and in large part formed." Such a reading has, of course, nothing in common with *religious* instruction. Besides, the New York *Evening Post* (July 16, 1902) rightly observed that a literary study of the Bible will never replace the old

¹¹ New York *Freeman's Journal*, January 24, 1903.

familiarity with the Bible, because the former intimate knowledge of the Bible was acquired by people who studied it as a theological book, and such it is essentially. Moreover, there is another and more serious objection to this scheme. Rightly has Dr. Harris, in his address at Boston, July, 1903, declared that the Bible is "a book sacredly kept apart from other literature." And Mr. Herbert W. Horwill, in a recent article on the "Bible in the Public School,"¹² says that "a merely literary and historical treatment of the Bible would actually impair its moral impression on the young." And how little religious instruction can be expected from this reading may be inferred from the fact that even Renan and Huxley have advocated such study of the Bible. It is a deplorable degradation of the sacred volume to put it on a par with profane writings, be they of the highest and purest type. And it is to be apprehended that such a method would destroy the reverence due to this divinely inspired book. Hence the scheme is not only inefficient, but wrong in principle and pernicious in its results.

Besides, no literary and historical study is worth the time spent on it, unless the teacher enters upon the matter, the ideas, the thoughts, the sentiments and principles of the masterpiece which is studied. But how is it possible to treat the matter, the thoughts and principles contained in the Bible without entering on religious discussions? And yet all religious comment must, according to the patrons of this new system, be scrupulously avoided. Hence, the very essence and characteristic feature of the sacred literature would have to be ignored and neglected. For the Bible is primarily and essentially religious literature. Consequently, this study of the Bible could hardly be profitable even from the merely literary and historical point of view. This is also the opinion of Mr. Horwill in his article in the *Atlantic Monthly*, September, 1903.

Any reasonable study of the Bible must, therefore, view particularly the religious character of the sacred books. But Catholics object to such reading of the Bible in schools which are frequented by Catholic children. They do so not from any neglect, dread or contempt of the sacred books, although such an erroneous view seems still to be a sort of accepted article of faith with many Protestants. The Catholic Church has always venerated and studied the Holy Scriptures, but at the same time affirms that there is an unwritten word of God, namely, Apostolical Tradition. Moreover, different from a popular Protestant theory, which makes it the right and duty of each individual to interpret the Bible for himself, Catholics believe that it belongs to the Church alone to determine the true sense of the Sacred Scriptures.¹³ The Church judges that

¹² *Atlantic Monthly*, September, 1903.

it is not necessary for all to read the Bible, for, as St. Paul says, "faith cometh by hearing," and whole nations received the faith without being able to read the Bible. The Church judges further that the reading of the whole Bible is injurious to the ignorant and children. On this account decrees were issued in the course of centuries prohibiting the reading of the Bible in the vernacular tongue, except in such translations as were sanctioned by the Church and, on difficult points, furnished with annotations from the writings of the Fathers of the Church and approved theologians. The faithful, provided they had sufficient knowledge, were even encouraged to read such Bibles, in order, as Pope Pius VII. said, "to draw from them purity of morals and of doctrine."

These general principles furnish the explanation of the attitude of the Catholic Church in regard to the reading of the Bible in schools. Catholics must first ask: Which translation is to be used? The Catholic Douay and Rheims version? It is almost certain that Protestant parents will object to this course, even in the State of New York, where the law forbids boards of education to determine what version shall be used, if any is admitted.¹⁴ Then the Protestant Bible is to be used? Catholics will object to this version, and rightly so. More than forty years ago a very interesting meeting was held by the American Association for the Advancement of Education.¹⁵ The president of the association, Professor Bache, expressed himself emphatically that moral and religious instruction should form a prominent element in all our systems of public education. Then as now it was said that the sufficient and only allowable means of this instruction was the reading of the Bible. In the discussion one speaker remarked that it was impracticable to teach the Bible in the schools of this country. For, he said, "there are respectable and religious portions of the community that will not yield to it. They will say that the reading of the King James version of the Bible is not warranted by their system of religion, and therefore you are attempting to engraft sectarian influence upon the school." On the same occasion another speaker observed: "As to the Bible being an unsectarian book, I believe that if there is a thoroughly Protestant book anywhere, it is King James' translation of the Bible. It is in vain to say that the book is Catholic, and that all appeal to it; for the Catholics do not appeal to King James' version." This really touches one of the principal objections of the

¹³ See the splendid little book, "The Bible and Its Interpreter," by P. H. Casey, S. J.

¹⁴ The legislation of various States on the reading of the Bible is given in the "Report of the Commissioner of Education," 1897-1898, Vol. II., pp. 1539-1574.

¹⁵ Barnard's "American Journal of Education," Vol. II., pp. 153-172.

Catholics to the reading of the Bible in the public schools. Some very apt observations have been made on this subject by Father Heuser in his "Chapters of Bible Study." Catholics claim that in point of fidelity to the original¹⁶—and this is the essential point when we speak of such a book—the Douay version is superior to the Protestant Bible of King James, though it may be inferior in its English. The strongest proof for the Catholic claim is furnished by the Protestants themselves. For if we compare the first Protestant English version, which departed considerably from the received Catholic text of the Vulgate, with all succeeding revisions, made at various times by the English Protestants, we find that they have steadily returned towards the old Catholic version. This is a confession, however reluctantly made, of past errors on the part of former Protestant translators. These errors consisted to a great extent in rendering the Bible so as to justify Protestant tenets and cast a slur on Catholic doctrines. Thus, to destroy the Catholic argument for the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff, Matthew xvi., 18, was translated: "Upon this rock I will build my congregation," instead of "my Church," which latter word was substituted again in later Bibles. The word *presbyteri* was rendered by "elders," *episcopi* by "overseers," etc. These and similar translations expressed distinctly the Protestant view of important points which were the subject of vehement controversy between Protestants and the Catholic Church. In 1871 a new revision of the authorized version was undertaken, the result of which was the Revised Version published between 1881 and 1885. In this edition about *twenty thousand* corrections were made, of which not less than fifty per cent. are textual. Dr. Ellicott, Protestant Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, president of the revising committee, says in the preface to the "Pastoral Epistles:" "It is vain to cheat our souls with the thought that these errors are either insignificant or imaginary. There *are* errors, there *are* inaccuracies, there are misconceptions, there are obscurities, not, indeed, so many in number or so grave in character as some of the forward spirits of the day would persuade us." Still, to a Catholic they *are* grave and must be so. In the Revised Version some of the more offensive translations have been changed, and that in the direction of the Catholic version. Thus the Catholic Bible translates the passage I. Cor. ii., 27, correctly, according to the original: "Whosoever shall eat the bread, *or* drink the cup." The Protestant Bible had "and" instead of "or," and Protestants were wont to abuse the Catholic Church for giving the Blessed Sacrament to the laity under one species, as opposed to Scripture. Now, after three hun-

¹⁶ It will be well to remind the reader of Ward's excellent book: "The Errata of the Protestant Bible."

dred years the Revised Version at last does justice to the true text by giving *or*, as the Catholic Bibles had always maintained. In some passages the *episcopi* have become "bishops," whereas in others they remain "overseers," perhaps because the *presbyteri* (priests) have remained "elders." In St. Matthew (vi., 13) the doxology, "For thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever," has at length been left out in the Revised Version, and only in a footnote is it stated that the passage is to be found in some ancient manuscripts. But they are not the best and most ancient manuscripts.

Thus the Protestant revisers have at last done away with the reproach frequently made against the Catholic Vulgate and the Rhemish Version. It has even happened that Catholic children, in "non-sectarian" schools, were punished for refusing to add this spurious doxology in the recital of the Lord's Prayer. An incident of this kind, which occurred in Illinois, has been related by the *Review* (St. Louis, February 28, 1901). Such facts may be rare, but they show not only that the teachers in question were both ignorant and bigoted, but also that the public schools are not always as "unsectarian" as they pretend to be, and that Catholic parents have good reasons to distrust the undenominational schools.

The case of the German Bible is very much like that of the English. From a literary point of view Luther's Bible was in many regards superior to the Catholic translations existing before Luther's time—eighteen different editions of the complete Bible in German, previous to Luther's, are still extant. Still, even enthusiastic admirers of Luther admit that it not only contains many improper, coarse and vulgar expressions, but, what is worse, that it contains most serious errors of translation. It is well known that the Reformer of Wittenberg took the greatest possible liberties in rendering the sacred text, so as to make it fit his peculiar tenets. Thus he rejected the whole epistle of St. James because it directly contradicted his teaching of justification by faith alone; he even added words, so as to bring out his own views; thus in the epistle to the Romans he added the word "alone," "man is justified by faith *alone*." The Protestant scholar Bunsen declares that "Luther's Bible is most inaccurate, although showing traces of great genius; three thousand passages need to be corrected."¹⁷ Palmer, a distinguished Protestant theologian, admonished the preachers: "Never tell the people that this or that passage has been wrongly translated by Luther; this is a secret which must be hushed in silence; at the most admit that the translation is obscure, not clear."¹⁸ We might

¹⁷ Janssen, "Geschichte des deutschen Volkes," Vol. VII., p. 553.

¹⁸ *Ibid*, p. 554.

here point out how wofully Protestants were deceived by those who talked so loudly about the "pure and unadulterated word of God," which they claimed for their translations. But for our present purpose it will suffice to ask whether the Catholic Church was not justified in forbidding her children to read unapproved versions of the Bible, and whether Catholics are to be reprehended for not trusting the Protestant Bible?

In many places, at least in Europe, it is the custom to give the children the whole Bible. To such a practice the Catholic Church has always objected. It has been said that the Church is afraid lest the "full" truth might be discovered from the Bible and "Romish superstitions" be exposed. The Church never entertained any such dread. Her anxiety at seeing the whole Bible in the hands of the young sprang from a motive of maternal love and care for the little ones. The *unabridged* Bible is no suitable book for the young. The reasons of the Church's anxiety ought to be obvious to every thoughtful Christian. The Bible relates not only virtuous actions, but also evil deeds of men, and that in such a manner that some passages will give occasion to abuse on the part of young and light-minded readers. It is true that to the pure everything is pure; but it is equally true that not all are pure. And it is an awful thought that the most sacred book should be abused by the impure to gratify their unholy curiosity and even to teach others what they should not know. And yet this happens in the case of the unabridged Bible. Let one, who was a Protestant, narrate what effect this reading of the Bible had on him in his earlier years. In a little book, entitled "*Adventures of a Protestant in Search of a Religion*" (New York, Sadlier, 1878, p. 40), we find the following passage: "The first book my mother gave me was a Bible. I learned to read it at her knee. . . . Of course, I understood nothing of it, and nobody, as far as I can remember, attempted to explain it. But I know it had a great effect on my mind; and it could not have been right to let me read it so young. . . . I read strange things in the Old Testament about killing thousands of people, even little babies, at the command of God; of terrible wars conducted for the purpose of making room for the Jews; and this seemed to tally ill with what my teacher said good people ought to do. I can see now why all these things were written, but cannot think it was right to fill a child's mind with slaughter and blood before he could possibly understand anything about it. And when I went to the Bible class I remember with shame how we lads would take a pride in searching out, on the sly, for passages to laugh at and deride, and can trace little if any good effect from such undue familiarity with sacred things. I think every good purpose would have been

served if careful selections had been made from Holy Scripture for our reading and the rest left till we were old enough to know how to appreciate it."

Now, lest it be said that these views of a man who went over to "Romanism" do not prove the point under discussion, we quote a passage from a modern standard work on higher education, the author of which is a Protestant and director of one of the best training schools for teachers in Germany. Professor Schiller, speaking of the causes of impurity among students, finds one cause in the reading of the unabridged Bible. He says that a *large experience has proved* that most deplorable vicious habits among pupils in schools, boys and girls, sprang up in the first place from the reading of certain passages of the Bible, the selection and knowledge of which were handed down traditionally among young people. Hence he sees a great danger for the moral purity of the pupils in the Protestant custom of giving the complete Bible into their hands. This danger, he says, can be so easily avoided by preparing special school Bibles that it is unintelligible how the whole Bible can be given to pupils.¹⁹ Other Protestant scholars and divines, as O'Callaghan, Semler, Delbrück, etc., have condemned the Protestant practice in this regard.

But let us suppose that the school boards would permit the use of the Catholic version in the public schools, would the Catholics then consent to the reading of the Bible? They would not consent to a reading carried on according to the principles laid down by the advocates of the system. Practically all of them wish the Bible to be read, "without any sectarian teaching," without "note and comment," as the charter of the city of New York and many similar documents declare. In the *Biblical World* (October, 1902) we read the following: "Can we not teach religion and morals by means of the Bible without at the same time teaching sectarian ideas? The Bible is not sectarian; Roman Catholics and all Protestant denominations equally claim it. The formal creeds and the systems of government and worship which have grown up in the centuries of Christian history are post-biblical; they are superstructure built upon the fundamentals of Christianity as recorded in the Bible. Can we get beneath ecclesiastical formulations, regulations and liturgies to a fundamental religious belief and moral practice upon which all Christians can agree and which they can unite to promote? . . . We believe that sectarianism is fast disappearing, that an era of unity in essentials is near at hand. . . . In order to restore the Bible to the schools it must be taught in the right way—the way which accords with the best knowledge of the Bible,

¹⁹ "Handbuch der praktischen Pädagogik" (3 ed., Leipzig, 1894), p. 171.

the best modern science of religious and ethical teaching and the best Christian spirit which recognizes true Christianity wherever it exists and is able to distinguish between essentials and non-essentials." Now, every intelligent man must see that this is nothing but that unsectarian, undenominational teaching of religion which has been so severely criticized and justly ridiculed by many distinguished Protestants. I am convinced that not a few Protestants will object to the latitudinarian views of the writer in the *Biblical World*; certainly all Catholics will protest against the statement that the formal creed is merely a post-biblical superstructure, and they will suspect and mistrust the way of teaching the Bible "according to the best modern knowledge of the Bible, the best modern science of religion." They will fear that this modern knowledge is largely influenced by the rationalistic views of Harnack and other leaders of modern Protestant thought. And their apprehensions are surely not without solid foundation when they hear that the disappearance of sectarianism is hailed as a most welcome sign. They will fear that a reading of the Bible carried on in this spirit will sap the very foundations of historic Christianity.

However, will not all dangers be obviated if the Bible is read without any explanation, without "note and comment," as the phrase is? Let us hear what Protestants have said on this subject. Dr. Schaffer, State Superintendent of Schools, Pennsylvania, said at the last convention of the National Educational Association: "Unless the Bible is properly read, I would not have it read at all."²⁰ But the "without note and comment" reading is not the proper reading. This has been very emphatically stated by an eminent Protestant statesman and writer. Disraeli says on this system: "I cannot imagine anything more absurd than that a teacher should read 'without note and comment,' as it is called, a passage from the Bible, and that children should be expected to profit by it. The 'without note and comment' people, in their anxiety to ward off proselytism, seem to have forgotten that if there is any book in the world which demands more explanation than another, it is the Bible. And so if nothing else is possible than such a feeble and useless compromise as this, I would, in the interest of the Bible itself, not have it read at all."²¹ In a speech in the House of Commons the same statesman had said: "There are but few of us who read chapters in either the Old or New Testament who do not require comment, and sometimes considerable, upon them." And yet children in the primary schools are expected to profit greatly by a reading without the least explanation! They are expected to derive from such a read-

²⁰ *Boston Evening Transcript*, July 7, 1903.

²¹ "Reminiscences," quoted in the *Fortnightly Review*, May, 1896.

ing all the necessary knowledge of religion and all the moral strength needed in the battles of life! Would we not laugh at a physician who thought it enough to *show* his patient a very salutary medicine and expected to cure him by this method? A cure can be effected only if the medicine is taken and absorbed by the system. Can the intellect of the young be enlightened and their will be strengthened by truths which they do not understand? If a teacher attempted to teach any branch without thoroughly explaining it; if he thought it sufficient just to read it to his pupils, such a teacher would be dismissed from the school without further ado. And rightly so; for he would show that he lacks the most elementary notions of pedagogy. But in the case of the most important and most difficult subject, the Bible and religion, that absurd system is to be adopted! It is advocated by men who in other lines of education manifest a keen insight into human nature and good educational sense. How is this inconsistency and want of logic to be explained? They see the necessity of religious training and yet they cling stubbornly to their cherished unsectarian school; they put a weak plaster on a dangerous ulcer, where a radical operation is needed. They will not succeed until they become convinced that any religious education worth the name can be given only on the basis of denominational principles in denominational schools.

However, could not some *general* explanation be given? The *Biblical World*, October, 1902, declared that the Bible should be read only for general and ethical religious instruction, not for the inculcation of any sectarian and theological ideas. We know what to think of that "general religious" training. A German Protestant, professor in the University of Strasburg, a man of very advanced views, not long ago emphatically stated that such "general" training in religion is "sheer nonsense, as all religion is denominational."²² Besides, even if such general explanations would be given, Catholics would always suspect that Protestant teachers would, at least unconsciously, instill their own ideas. The *Biblical World* says in the passage referred to that "Protestant teachers taught the Bible in a way which antagonized the Roman Catholics, and teachers of the several Protestant denominations interpreted the Bible to the children from their own point of view." Can we expect that it ever will and, considering human nature, can be otherwise? We think not. Hence that general and ethical religious interpretation is as unpracticable as it is inefficient for the purpose for which it is recommended.

Could not *selections* from the Bible be made of such passages as will offend no one? This has been suggested lately. But we think

²² Ziegler, "Allgemeine Pädagogik," Leipzig, 1901, p. 107.

the objections dwelt on hitherto must be raised also against the reading of selections in schools where there are children of different denominations. Selections as well as the whole Bible need explanations, and the "without note and comment" reading of single passages is as useless as the reading of the whole Bible. Let us see how select passages could be read, consistently with undenominational principles. What can be selected from the Old Testament? We grant that a great number of passages from the *didactic* books, the Psalms, etc., could be selected which contain valuable ethical injunctions. But shall the teacher be allowed to declare that these books are divinely inspired? I think not; for this would be teaching "dogma." But if this is not taught, the passages will not have that authority which is attributed to them by all sincere Christians, hence it is scarcely an instruction in the Bible. Shall any *historical* passages be permitted? There can be no doubt that the Biblical accounts of the creation, the deluge, the destruction of the wicked cities of Sodom and Gomorrha, the election of Abraham, etc., are not only necessary for a satisfactory understanding of the New Testament, but also contain most valuable ethical lessons. Shall they be read? Suppose they are read, must not the pupils ask whether these accounts are true history or mere legends? What will the teacher do? If he believes these accounts to be true history, and states his conviction, he teaches dogma, which, according to the system advocated, he is not allowed to do. If he belongs to the more advanced Protestants and considers them merely adaptations of the Babylonian myths, shall he tell the pupils his conviction? In that case, too, he would teach dogma, although a false and pernicious one. Or shall he give an evasive answer and thus instill doubt in the minds of the young? It cannot be denied that in this country there are teachers who entertain rather "liberal" views in regard to the Old Testament. One may infer this from the attitude of the ministers of various denominations, as evinced by recent discussions about the story of "Jonah and the whale," and other narratives of the Bible. It may be worse in other countries, for instance in Germany. As an illustration we refer to the recent discussions about the book and the lectures of Professor Delitzsch on "Babel and the Bible,"²³ or to an article which appeared a few months ago in one of the leading educational reviews in Germany.²⁴ The article is headed: "Some Objections to the Reading of Old Testament Stories in Secondary Schools." The author represents it as an intolerable and outrageous state of affairs that Protestant theologians are obliged to teach the *myths* of the Old Testament as

²³ See the *Catholic Mind*, No. 8, April 22, 1903: "The Bible and Assyriology."

²⁴ "Monatschrift für höhere Schulen," Berlin, October, 1902.

historical facts. He further asserts that the *majority* of the Protestant theologians who teach in higher schools do not consider the deluge, the account of the creation, the story of the tower of Babel as historical. For this reason they should not be taught in the lower classes; in the higher classes, according to this author, the Old Testament history may be taught as part of the history of religions. There the teacher may tell the students "what opinions the Jews entertained about the creation of the world," etc. That some people in America have similar views of the Bible need not be proved; how many teachers hold such opinions I am not able to determine. But Catholics suspect the teaching of Protestants in this regard; for, as the individual has the right of private judgment in religious matters, also in regard to the Bible, no one knows how far advanced this or that individual teacher may be in his views. There are certainly still many Protestants who firmly believe in the Divine inspiration of Scripture, but are they the majority? More than thirty years ago Professor Hettinger said that Protestant criticism had explained the Bible away so completely as to leave nothing but the cover. The latest theories advocated by the leading Protestant scholars, as Harnack and others, go very far to prove this assertion. All this must make a Catholic feel uneasy at the thought that Protestants should teach his children the Bible, which he firmly believes to be an inspired book in all its parts.

Well, then, let the *selections* be made *from the New Testament*. Will this remove all difficulties? By no means; "higher criticism" has not dealt more leniently with the New Testament than with the Old, and what parent can know the attitude of the teacher of his children toward the Gospels? But granted that the teacher is a believer in the inspired character of the New Testament, what course will he take in the explanations? For, we repeat, some sort of explanation is absolutely necessary. Further, what is he going to read? Are any *miracles* of Christ included in the selections? If all miracles are excluded, it cannot be said that the *Gospel* is taught; for the miracles form an essential part of the life of Christ. It is said of Him that "he began to *do* and to teach" (Acts i., 1), and an account of Christ without the miracles would be a caricature. Moreover, do not His miracles present most beautiful ethical lessons? Does the feeding of the multitude, the raising of the widow's son and of Lazarus, the healing of the blind and the sick not contain most important injunctions of mercy and love for our neighbor? But suppose miracles are included in the selections, then the question will naturally rise in the minds of the pupils: Is this true? And if true, how was this possible? This question, whether directly proposed by the pupils or not, must be answered. If not, doubt will

remain in the minds of the young. But how is an answer possible without teaching dogma? If the teacher gives the true explanation he has to state that Christ was God and wrought these signs as a token of His infinite mercy and, at the same time, as proofs of His Divine character, as He Himself expressly declares in many passages.

Shall the great and fundamental *mysteries* of the Gospel be included in the selections: the story of Bethlehem and of Calvary? How can they be understood unless a solid dogmatic explanation is given? What makes the Babe in the manger so attractive to the Christian heart and inspires it with genuine love and high resolve of a virtuous life? Nothing but the fact that this weak child is the Eternal Word Incarnate, who "came down from heaven for our sake in order to bring us salvation," as the Creed has it. Or that awful tragedy of the cross? If the child is not told that the meek and humble sufferer is the Son of God, who voluntarily took upon Himself disgrace, torments and death in order to atone for our sins and to redeem us from eternal death—if such instruction is not given, the child may pity the innocent victim of the hatred of the Pharisees, but it will not rise to any religious sentiment nor to any noble moral resolutions. To such a child the cross will remain "foolishness," as it was to the heathen of old. Again, take that solemn and awe-inspiring scene before Caiphas, where Christ is conjured to declare whether he is the Son of the living God. How can this be understood without dogmatic teaching that He who stands there as a meek lamb before the wolves is in truth the Son of God and the future judge of the world? In short, the whole life and character of Christ is unintelligible without solid dogmatic teaching. Now, the teacher has to say either that this Christ was a great and wise man, but nothing more, and in this case the "dogma" of the Unitarian is taught, and every parent who believes in the Divinity of our Lord must earnestly protest against such teaching, or the teacher says that this great man was not mere man, but truly God; then the Unitarian will object, not to mention the case where the children of Jewish parents may be present.

Accordingly, the miracles and the characteristic scenes of the life of Christ must go; but have we not enough left in the beautiful *words* of the great Master? In fact, it has often been suggested to confine the New Testament reading chiefly to the discourses of Christ. But can the words of Christ be understood without dogmatic explanation? There is in the literature of the whole world nothing more beautiful, more elevating and inspiring than the *parables* of our Lord. Read them to the children. Yet how can the true meaning of these allegories be grasped by the young with-

out comment? Who are the sower, the reapers, the enemy? What is the field and the fire into which the tares are cast? What the banquet of the King, the wedding garment, the vineyard, the laborers' wages? Read the parable of Lazarus and Dives. What is that hell mentioned there? Is there such a thing as hell, is there any fire, is hell eternal? These and similar questions necessarily will rise in the minds of the children. Shall they be answered? And if so, how? Or are these parables to be read only in a mutilated form? Then the whole purport is lost and it would be better not to read them at all. It has been frequently proposed to read the *Sermon on the Mount*, especially the Beatitudes. Very well. But who are the poor in spirit, the clean of heart? What is the promised Kingdom of Heaven? And if it were asked, as it ought to be, why we should accept such doctrine, why we should consider the poor in spirit blessed, why we should strive after perfect cleanness of heart and body—shall it be said that such principles are noble? Will this suffice for light-minded youths in whose hearts the animal instincts are so powerful and the will-power so weak? Or shall it be said that the teacher who uttered them was so wise and his maxims so beautiful? Then we might read to the children Plato's dialogues, where he pictures the great teacher of Athens and narrates many beautiful sayings; we need not object even to the reading of Buddhist maxims, which some have wished—blasphemously, as every Christian says—to be substituted for the principles of Christianity. I say we need not object to such reading if we want merely to read beautiful maxims; for there are such in pagan writings. But the characteristic of the reading of the Bible—teaching with *authority*—will perish unless it is clearly stated, as the Bible does state, that he who spoke thus had supreme authority, to which every man must submit. From the lips of the Divine Teacher came words of grace and beauty, but above all He spoke with supreme authority: "He was teaching as one having power and not as the scribes" (Mark i., 22). This power can never be expected from reading the words of Christ unless the Divine nature of the Great Teacher is clearly set forth.

One point, then, is evident, namely, that no reading of the Bible can be fruitful without interpretation, and no interpretation can be given which does not assume some definite attitude towards dogma, towards some specified creed. Hence we are justified in saying that the problem of religious instruction cannot be solved by reading the Bible, as suggested by many Protestant educators. We readily admit that the recent movement for the introduction of the reading of the Bible is inspired by the best and noblest motives, and we honor the efforts of Protestant educators in this regard. But we

regret to see them adopt means which certainly will prove a failure. For the remedy which they wish to apply is an inefficient one. A Catholic cannot help noticing another feature in the discussions of Protestants on this great problem, namely, a lack of consistency and courage. They deplore the present state of affairs, the decline of religion in the young; they suggest remedies, devise new plans and methods of teaching religion; but they do not dare to say plainly and boldly that the much vaunted public system is wrong in a most fundamental principle. For there can be no reasonable doubt as to the only efficient remedy: religion must be taught in the schools, but any religious teaching worth the name is possible only in *denominational* schools. The catechism must be taught; the Bible must be read, and a great deal of it, but it must be explained according to the dogmas of the Church. For the Church has received the sacred injunction to lead mankind to its final destination. To the Church, and not to the State nor to any school board, has the Divine Master, to whom "is given all power in heaven and on earth," addressed the words: "Go ye into the whole world and preach the Gospel to every creature." For this reason Catholics oppose the school system which excludes religion. He who is not for Christ is against Him, and separation from Him is ruin and death; an education that excludes him is "Christless" and, therefore, really "godless." It has rightly been said that if to-day Christ were on earth and should enter almost any public school in the country, the teacher, acting on his instructions, would have to show Him the door. If He were to enter many a private school, He would be worshiped by teacher and scholar on bended knee. This would surely be the case in Catholic schools.

These principles hold good of *secondary and higher education* as well as of the primary.²⁵ It is a widespread error, at least in practice, that it is sufficient to teach religion in the lower schools. This system is first of all very incongruous. The student in the higher schools makes daily progress in secular knowledge, and that which is far higher, far nobler and far more important, the knowledge of his religion, remains what it was in childhood. This is certainly not a harmonious development of the highest faculties of the student's mind. The Christian idea of progress is that the young should "advance in wisdom and grace" not only before man, but above all before God; not only in human, but especially in Divine knowledge.

This system of confining religious instruction to the primary

²⁵ On this subject see also the present writer's recent work: "Jesuit Education, Its History and Principles Viewed in the Light of Modern Educational Problems" (Herder, St. Louis, 1903), particularly chapter xviii., "Religious Instruction."

schools is also fraught with the greatest dangers. Especially in these days, when agnosticism or even open hostility towards revealed religion domineer in science and literature, the student of higher institutions of learning must be safeguarded against the sophisms of infidelity. Hundreds of objections against the doctrines of Christianity which he learned in his childhood will be cast in his way, objections from philosophy, natural sciences, history and Biblical criticism. He will hear that scientists deny the spirituality and immortality of the soul, free will, the existence of God; arguments from archæology are arrayed against the authenticity of the Bible, against the historic character of the Mosaic records; arguments from philosophy against the Divinity of Christ, and numberless arguments from history against the doctrines and practices of the Catholic Church. What will happen if no solid course of religious instruction is given, which in the higher grades must be largely apologetical? Doubts will arise as to the truth of what he was taught in his childhood; they will grow stronger and more dangerous, and having no guide to solve them, the young man will soon succumb and swell the ranks of agnostics or infidels. This calamity would have been avoided if a course of apologetics had accompanied the training in secular knowledge; if the student had heard that the six days of creation, which seem to contradict the established results of geology and paleontology, need not be taken as days of twenty-four hours each, but as long periods, or as six revelations made on successive days to Adam or Moses; if he had been instructed that the miracle related in the book of Josue need not mean that the sun actually stood still. If such and similar explanations had been given the student, the loss of his faith would have been avoided. If numerous facts of history had been correctly stated and explained, he would not have been weakened in his love for his Church; he would have been able to solve the difficulties made by infidels; he would have been able to remove many a prejudice from the minds of his Protestant fellow-men.

In this connection we may be permitted to quote at some length a beautiful passage from the writings of the great Cardinal Newman. He says a Catholic youth who has received a higher education "should know the great primitive divisions of Christianity, its polity, its luminaries, its acts and its fortunes, its great eras and its course down to this day. He should have some idea of its propagation and of the order in which the nations which have submitted to it entered its pale;²⁶ and of the list of its Fathers, and of its writers generally,

²⁶ Such an outline of history is contained in the three volumes of the "History of the Christian Era," by Father Guggenberger (Herder, St. Louis, Mo., 1899-1901).

and of the subjects of their works. And so in like manner, as regards Biblical knowledge, it is desirable that, while our students are encouraged to pursue the history of classical literature, they should also be invited to acquaint themselves with some general facts about the canon of Holy Scripture, its history, the Jewish canon, St. Jerome, the Protestant Bible; again, about the languages of Scripture, the contents of its separate books, their authors and their versions.

"But now as to theology itself. . . . Certainly I admit that when a lawyer, or physician, or statesman, or merchant, or soldier sets about discussing theological points, he is likely to succeed as ill as an ecclesiastic who meddles with law, or medicine, or the exchange. But I would encourage Christian knowledge so far as it bears upon the history, the literature and the philosophy of Christianity. . . . I should desire to encourage in our students an intelligent apprehension of the relations, as I may call them, with society at large . . . the respective prerogatives of the Church and the civil power; what the Church claims of necessity, what it cannot dispense with, what it can; whether the celibacy of the clergy is a matter of faith; what is the difference between canon and civil law, what is meant by intention, what by the *opus operatum*. Questions may be multiplied without limit which occur in conversation between friends, in social intercourse or in the business of life, when no argument is needed, no subtle disquisition, but a few direct words stating the fact, and when perhaps a few words may even hinder most serious inconveniences to the Catholic body. Half the controversies which go on in the world arise from ignorance of the facts of the case; half the prejudices against Catholicity lie in the misinformation of the prejudiced parties. Candid persons are set right and enemies silenced by the mere statement of what it is that we believe. It will not answer the purpose of a Catholic to say, 'I leave it to theologians; I will ask my priest;' but it will commonly give him a triumph as easy as it is complete if he can then and there lay down the law."²⁷

Any one acquainted with contemporary literature will agree with the great Cardinal. How often has it been stated by Catholics that Papal Infallibility does not mean impeccability—Catholics do not deny the scandals of John XII. or Alexander VI.—nor that it is infallibility in private opinions, but merely freedom from error in an authoritative, *ex cathedra* decision in matters of faith and morals; that Catholics do not *adore* the mother of God, but venerate her; that indulgences are not remission of sin, least of all of future sins, but of temporal punishment due to sin after its remission; and yet the same misrepresentations are repeated. The old errors about

²⁷ "Idea of a University," pp. 372-378.

prohibition of Bible reading, the calumnies of immured nuns, of Pope Joan, of the *Monita Secreta*, of Jesuit superiors obliging their subjects "to commit sin," of the Jesuits teaching that "the end justifies the means," these and countless other slanders have been refuted a thousand times, and yet they continue to be made. The cause of truth and justice, if not that of religion, make it a necessity for all Catholics, especially the educated, to be well informed on these questions. And it is the duty of college instructors to impart this knowledge. It may not be useless for teachers in Catholic colleges to ask themselves whether they actually fulfil this duty to the extent and in the manner which are imperatively demanded at the present day, and whether they give the pupils, especially in higher classes, that apologetical and solid dogmatical training which is so necessary? This question may furnish matter for serious and conscientious self-examination, and if the answer should be a sorrowful "peccavimus," the remedy of this defect is obvious.

It has been said in England and in this country that at many public institutions the faith of Catholics will be in no danger, as they will be obliged (as in England) or have at least an opportunity, to attend their own church, and as the local priests may look after their spiritual instruction. This evasion, for it is no more, has been well answered by Father John Gerard, S. J.: "Can it possibly be supposed that those brought up under such conditions should learn to regard their faith as their supreme treasure, the pearl of great price to purchase which a man does well to sacrifice all else? Who that has experience of the waywardness and perversity of youth, who knows how hard a task it is under the most favorable of conditions to produce such loyalty to the Church as will stand the stress and strain of life, and has learnt by experience how plastic is boy nature to take a shape from every influence to which it is exposed, will not realize how impossible it is to anticipate, at least in the vast majority of instances, that anything resembling a true Catholic spirit should result from such a manner of bringing up? Living in an atmosphere which must necessarily be altogether alien from that of faith, in close intimacy with those, whether teachers or comrades, who regard that faith with contemptuous dislike or at best with utter indifference, how shall a poor boy find in an occasional visit to a church or a presbytery influences potent enough to enable him to realize the surpassing importance of that for which so scanty provision seems to be considered sufficient? Certainly an education upon such lines does not appear calculated to produce men of the type that risked fortune and liberty in order that their children's education should before all else be Catholic."²⁸

²⁸ The London *Tablet*, September 14, 1901.

Catholics, therefore, rightly distrust any school, primary or secondary, from which the teaching of their religion is excluded. And all other advantages that may seem to accrue to them from such a system of public instruction must appear to them as trifles compared to the one consideration which the Eternal Truth and Wisdom has pronounced: "What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his own soul"—and the souls of those who are dearest to him on earth, his children? How noble, how heroic is the generosity of those Catholic parents who are willing to make any sacrifice in order to give their children a thoroughly Christian education. This, indeed, is a practical application of our Lord's sacred injunction: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His justice."

What, then, follows from these truths? A conclusion which the late Pontiff, Leo XIII., has proclaimed in 1897, on the occasion of the centenary of Blessed Peter Canisius, the founder of several famous Catholic colleges throughout Germany, Austria and Switzerland. "All schools, from the elementary to the university, should be thoroughly Catholic, and one of the main duties of the pastors of the Church is to safeguard the rights of parents and the Church in this matter. It is of the very greatest importance that Catholics should have everywhere for their children not mixed schools, but their own schools, and these provided with good and well-trained masters. Let no one delude himself that a sound moral training can be separated from dogmatic religious training. To separate the training in knowledge from all religious influence is to form citizens to be the bane and pest of society instead of being the bulwark of their country. Moreover, it is not for youths to be taught religion at fixed hours, but all their training must be permeated by religious principles."

This is the Catholic position in regard to religious instruction. These are the truths which they uphold against the errors prevalent in so many modern systems of education. The position of the Catholics is reasonable and is the practical application of the principles taught by the Divine Master, who alone is "the Way, the Truth and the Life." This is the road by which the Church endeavors to lead the children to Christ, complying with the loving wish of the Divine friend of children: "Suffer little children to come to me and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven."

R. SCHWICKERATH, S. J.

Woodstock, Md.

CHAPTERS IN IRISH HISTORY CONNECTED WITH THE UNION, AND THE ATTEMPT TO ENACT THE VETO.

1. *Historical Review of the State of Ireland, From the Invasion of Henry II. to its Union With Great Britain in 1801.* By Francis Plowden, Esq. 3 vols., quarto, each 1,200 pages. London, 1803.

2. *Memoirs of the Life and Times of the Right Hon. Henry Grattan.* By his son, Henry Grattan, Esq., M. P. 5 vols, octavo, each 600 pages. London: Henry Colborn, 1849.

3. *The Life of the Right Honorable John Philpot Curran, Master of the Rolls in Ireland.* By his son, William Henry Curran. Edited by R. Shelton Mackenzle, D. C. L. 1 vol., 6 mo., pp. 550. Redfield, New York, 1855.

THE eclipse of the Stuart dynasty and the accession of the line of Orange princes to the British throne had had a serious effect upon the status of the Roman Catholic religion in Great Britain and Ireland. In the latter kingdom, where four-fifths of the natives of the soil had adhered to the faith of their ancestors, its worst consequences had been experienced. In no part of Europe were there in existence such revolting penal laws against the practice of the Catholic religion as were to be found in the British code! And nowhere else in all Europe were such laws so brutally enforced as in Ireland. That the ancient faith which had been planted by Christian fathers in the "Island of Saints" had not been wiped out of existence during the dark periods of bloody persecution was owing to the Divine promise that the powers of hell should not prevail against the Church of Christ! To state the facts plainly, the code of laws under which the people of both kingdoms were governed had for their foundation the axiom "No Popery." The king, the princes and the Government swore by the same motto, "No Popery."

The non-Catholic population of Ireland, aggregating probably three-fourths of a million souls (1782), comprised the privileged classes. They alone of the people of the kingdom, high or low, could hold office "under the crown." They alone could enter government colleges and acquire degrees. To this class the professions were open, with the privileges of practising in the courts and of attaining the judicial hierarchy. They alone could obtain commissions in the army and navy and obtain other innumerable privileges which no Catholic was permitted to enjoy.

Co-existing was "The Church by Law Established," as O'Connell was accustomed to qualify its claims for reverence, with its hierarchy and its regiment of 900 fat salaried incumbents, occupying the places and emoluments and the spoliated foundations and livings which had been wrested from the hierarchy and clergy of the Roman Catholic

faith, and who, although, it is claimed, were inferior and unlearned as a class, were provided for by incomes from tithes, from the payment of which none were exempt. Besides, the incumbents of the "established church" had been given the exclusive custody of the official parochial registers of births, marriages and of mortality of all classes and creeds, the fees of which were rigorously exacted, which in the aggregate materially added to their salaries.

Such was the incubus fastened on the Irish people, including the dissenting non-Catholic sects. Among the latter were the Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, who were most generally to be found in the northern parts, and the Quakers in the cities and towns. All these sects were compelled to build their respective places of worship, to maintain these structures and to support their own ministers, while they were obliged by law to pay their share of tithes for the support of the incumbents of the Church of England in common with the preponderating members of the Roman Catholic Church. Tithes being an annual extortion were most severely felt and became a standing and a popular grievance, the cause of outbreaks and excesses disgraceful to a civilized people and detrimental to the cause of religion.¹

The exorbitant demands which were made by the agents of the Protestant clergy, who were denominated *tithe proctors*, increased ten fold the original evil. They were generally a needy and low race of men, who had but little regard for the interests of their employers or the wants of the people; they performed their invidious task at some hazard and without much feeling. They required a high percentage; their charges were excessive and the mode of collection insolent, haughty and exasperating. Here is a partial list of tithes exacted by the Protestant incumbents:

A barrel of grain for every plough in some places; 2 quarts of wheat for every acre ploughed; in other places, one sheaf of some sort of grain for every horse at the plough; 32 quarts of oats and one quart of wheat for every hack horse at the plough at lenten time. In Connaught, 6 pence per year for married couples; those couples living a long time must come to court, prove their marriage and then pay about \$2 for their certificate. In Connaught also a crock of butter from each family once a year. From a poor man having but one cow a sheep was exacted annually; for well-to-do people, *their best garment* was confiscated and the *best garment of a woman* of like condition shared the same fate. Every brewery paid an annual tax of one gallon of its product. If a beggar died in a man's house the owner who had sheltered him had to pay a tax equivalent to about a dollar. If a dead body was carried through another

¹ Grattan, Vol. III., p. 298.

parish for interment a tax must be paid the former equivalent to a burial tax. Parsons, vicars or curates in charge of parish registers not only exacted a registration fee, but they also collected a minimum charge equivalent to one dollar for christenings, marriages and burials registered by them!²

The demand for tithes was so excessive in some parts of Ireland that many non-Catholics refused payment, and suits at law were commenced for their collection. In Kings, Meath, Westmeath and Queens counties fifty or more suits had been commenced, mostly against Protestants. Many of the latter throughout the kingdom became disgusted with the continuous exactions of the ministers of the Church of England. All through the eighteenth century they emigrated in groups to America. This accounts for the large number of families of Irish stock to be found in Western Pennsylvania. Thus Ireland's loss became America's gain, while the population of the State mentioned as well as of others was enriched by a class of immigrants who as a rule were educated and intelligent, including good farmers and good mechanics.

Finally, but in modern times, during the political sway of William E. Gladstone, an act of Parliament was passed disestablishing the Church of England in Ireland. This was accomplished by the payment of large sums for the purchase of life annuities for Irish prelates and Irish incumbents; for the cancellation of claims made by beneficiaries of the establishment; for compensation for the relinquishment of perquisites of all sorts held by high as well as by low individuals as positions during life, all of which had to be considered, adjudicated and consideration given in money or in life annuities before a final settlement could be made and the incubus of three centuries of standing could be lifted from the economical status of the Irish people.

In 1781-2 had occurred the termination of the American Revolution, when England lost her American colonies. The defensive condition of Ireland was critical. The British forces from necessity had been withdrawn from the kingdom and she was practically unprotected from outside attack on the part of the enemies of the British Empire. *There was not an entire company of British soldiers available in Ireland!*

In this emergency a call for volunteers was made by the leading men of the respective provinces for national defense. This call was promptly responded to and an Irish army, in which were included men of all religious belief, was rapidly organized. England was called upon for arms, munitions, stores and equipments, and she committed the political blunder of arming a force of 80,000

² Grattan, III., p. 300.

men who were by no means too friendly to British control. The supreme command of this Irish volunteer army was given to Lord Charlemont.

It was the most powerful and patriotic organization which had ever legally existed on Irish soil. The uniforms of the officers and men were suggestive of the national spirit. Coincidental was the election of the members of the Irish House of Commons of 1782. This to a great extent was perfunctory, as the following details will show:

The County of Antrim had a population of 111,000. It was under the patronage of four earls and one knight, owners of the soil, who controlled five boroughs, each of which had two burgesses to elect for the House of Commons. The electors had 3,500 votes.

The County of Armagh, which elected four burgesses, with a population of 84,000, had 2,400 voters, under the control of the Protestant Primate and the Earl of Charlemont.

The County of Carlow, whose population was 34,200, being mostly Catholic, had only 25 qualified voters. These were controlled by the Protestant Bishop and Mr. William Burton, under whose patronage four burgesses were elected.

The County of Cavan, with a population of 68,000, had 1,800 voters. It had two boroughs and elected four burgesses. It was controlled by the Earl of Cavan and Lord Belmore.

The County of Clare, which had a population of 66,000, with only 848 qualified voters, had three boroughs and elected six burgesses. It was controlled by the Lord of the soil.

The County of Cork, population 250,000, had eleven boroughs. The city of Cork was politically independent. But the balance of the county was under the political control of the absentee Duke of Devonshire; the Earl of Cork, Lords Donneraile, Middleton and Shannon, Sir John Freke and the Jephson and Clifford families. It had 1,243 voters.

The County of Donegal, with a population of 67,000, had five boroughs. It was under the political control of the Lords Arran, Clenmere and Erne and the Knights Connolly and Conyngham, with 2,500 voters.

The County of Down, with a population of 137,000, including the independent town of Drogheda, had six boroughs. Outside of Drogheda the political control was vested in the Lords Bangor, Carrickfane, Clifford and Hillsborough, Sir John Blackwood and Messrs. Stewart and Ponsonby. It had 6,000 voters.

The city of Dublin had a population of 300,000. It was a free city. Outside, the County of Dublin had 57,000. The political

control of the county was vested in John Latouche, the banker, and Mr. Beresford. Electors for city and county, 4,000.

The County of Fermanagh had a population of 30,000, with one borough. It had 2,537 electors.

The County of Galway had three boroughs. Its population was 166,250, which included the town of Galway, with 12,000. Outside of the latter the political control was vested in the Bingham and Blakeny families. The town was controlled by the Daly families. Electors of town and county, 700.

The Catholic County of Kerry, population 75,000, had three boroughs. It was under the political control of Lord Glundore, Sir E. Denny and Mr. Townsend, and had 1,000 electors.

The Catholic County of Kildare, with a population of 50,000, had four boroughs. It was under the political control of the Duke of Leinster and Lord Mayo, and had only 26 electors.

The County of Kilkenny, with a population of 87,000, had five boroughs. Its political control under Lord Clifden was rotten and venal. Otherwise under Sir Hector Langrishe and Messrs. Agar, Flood and Tigue it was blameless. Included in the total population was the city of Kilkenny, with a population of 14,000, controlled by the English Bishop of Ossory. It had 1,050 voters.

Kings County had a population of 48,000, with two boroughs. It was under the political control of Lords Belvidere and Molesworth, associated with Mr. D. B. Daly. It had 900 voters.

The County of Leitrim, with a population of 35,300, had two boroughs. For such a small population it was under the distinguished political control of the Lords Leitrim and Mountrath, Colonel St. George and the King family. It had 1,076 voters.

The County of Limerick had a population of 120,000 and had two boroughs. This included the city of Limerick, with a population of 40,000, whose political status was independent. But the political control otherwise, under the Hon. Hugh Massey and the Hon. Samuel Oliver, was stated to have been venal and rotten. There were 1,250 voters in this county.

The County of Londonderry, with a population of 90,000, had three boroughs. It was under the political patronage of the Earl of Tyrone, the Right Hon. Richard Jackson and Thomas Connolly, with only 724 voters.

Here is the status of the Catholic County of Longford: Population, 40,000, with four boroughs; controlled by Lord Granard, venal and corrupt; Lord Longford, venal and corrupt; Mr. Dillon, venal; Mr. Geeville and Mrs. McCartney, venal and rotten. Total voters, 700.

The County of Louth, population 47,000, had four boroughs and

was under the political control of Right Hon. John Foster, H. Codrington, J. and C. Buxton, Robert Ross and Ross Moore. It had 730 voters.

The Catholic County of Mayo, with a population of 120,000, had one borough, under the political control of Lord Lucan. It had only 1,000 electors.

The County of Meath, population 47,000, had six boroughs. It was under the political control of Lords Bective, Darnley, Ludlow and Mornington, with Sir B. Chapman, Sir George Lowther, James Preston, Abel Ram and Thomas Trotter. The control of James Preston was said to have been venal. The county had 1,200 voters.

The Catholic County of Monaghan had 99,000 population, with one borough. It was under the political control of Lords Clermont and Blaney, whose management was venal. It had only 700 voters.

Queens County had a population of 70,000 and three boroughs. It was under the political management of Lords Carlow, Drogheda and Stanhope, the Rev. Dean Booth and Sir John Parnell, with 1,400 voters.

The Catholic County of Roscommon had a population of 40,000, with three boroughs. It was under the political management of Lords Kingston and Maldon. There were also Mr. Foxlane, Mrs. Walcott and Mrs. Walsingham. It had only 36 voters.

The Catholic County of Sligo, with a population of 36,000, had one borough, which was under the venal management of Owen Wynne, with only 13 voters.

The County of Tipperary, with a population of 111,000, had three boroughs. It was under the political control of Lord Mount Cashel, also Messrs. Barton, Moore, O'Callaghan and Penefather. The whole county was so Catholic that only 1,100 electors were qualified to vote.

The County of Tyrone, with a population of 123,000, had four boroughs. It was under the political control of the Bishop of Clogher, the Lords Abercorn and Welles and Messrs. Moulruy and Richardson. The control of Dungannon was said to have been venal. Total voters, 3,000.

The County of Waterford, with a population of 52,000, which included the city of Waterford, had four boroughs. Outside the city, which was independent, the political control of the remaining 12,000 was under the English absentee Duke of Devonshire and the Lords Shannon and Tyrone. There were only 1,500 voters.

The County of Westmeath had a population of 70,000, with four boroughs. It was under the political control of Rev. Dean Handcock, the Lords Granard and Westmeath, Sir Richard St. George

and Charles Lambert. The management of Fore and Kilbeggan was venal, while the total number of voters was only 1,120.

The Catholic County of Wexford, with a population of 78,000, had eight boroughs. Its political control included Lord Ely and Sir Vincent Coldough, with Messrs. Heare, Leigh, Loftus, Neville, Ram and Charles Tottenham as sharers in its venal political spoils. It had only 917 voters, and the competition for the prey must have been active.

The Catholic County of Wicklow had a more honorable record. Its population was 57,000, with only 900 qualified voters, under the political control of Lords Aldborough, Carysfort, Hillsborough and Mr. William Tighe, whose separate and local jurisdiction seems to have been without reproach.

The total number of voters in all Ireland at this period was 143,485, all of whom were non-Catholic.

The Irish House of Commons of 1782 included 300 members. To which:

Thirty-two counties contributed—Knights.....	64
Seven cities contributed—citizens.....	14
University of Dublin.....	2
One hundred and ten boroughs sent burgesses.....	220
<hr/>	
Total members.....	300
Returned by the people.....	81
Returned by patrons.....	219—300

The Irish House of Lords included one duke, twenty-nine earls, twenty-four viscounts, twenty-six barons and nineteen Protestant archbishops and bishops—in all ninety-nine members.³

Home rule, a liberal constitution and an independent Irish Parliament had been forced from England by Ireland in 1782 under the pressure of a well equipped army of Irish volunteers commanded by Lord Charlemont. England nominally governed, through an English Viceroy, the Lord Lieutenant in Dublin Castle, but the control of Irish affairs had been relegated to the Irish Parliament, comprising a House of Lords and a House of Commons, whose sway was supreme.

This home rule government began in 1782 and was destroyed in 1800 by the most corrupt political methods known in modern times, under the sanction of the English Viceroy, Lord Cornwallis, whose factotum in the scandalous work was Lord Castlereagh. *The members of both houses of the Irish Parliament were exclusively non-Catholic.* In fact, throughout the British Empire at the time

³ Plowden, II., Appendix.

Roman Catholics were disfranchised and subject to odious penal laws.

It was time this change had occurred, for affairs in Ireland were in a sad condition. Her peasantry had become demoralized, while her commerce and manufactures had been hampered and dwarfed by English interference whenever Irish competition got the better of English lines of trade that a partial collapse seemed inevitable. The House of Lords of the Irish Parliament was composed of the Protestant nobility, with the Archbishops and Bishops of the Established Church. The majority of the members of the House of Commons were elected under the patronage of the patrons of the boroughs, while the minority were elected by the independent boroughs and the free towns and cities.

The brightest and most talented of the professions, eminent merchants, shrewd bankers and cultivated gentlemen, combined to make the Irish House of Commons of 1782 one of the most intelligent legislative assemblies in Europe. But all this combination of talent and distinction was, as stated, unfortunately non-Catholic. But what this Parliament accomplished for Ireland is set forth by Mr. Henry Grattan, who compiled the memoirs of his illustrious father, whose efforts are admitted to have secured in this Parliament the constitutional freedom of Ireland. Yet this Parliament, he writes, in spite of its defects, did more for the country in the very short space of time it was allowed to live than England had effected in all her long and varied struggles for liberty.

Ireland removed the restraints that had long been imposed, through English jealousy and opposition, on her commerce and her constitution; she repealed Poyning's law; she insisted on the repeal of the 6th of George the First; she restored the final judicature to her lords; she established free trade; she obtained an independent constitution; she established the independence of her judges; she secured to the country the benefits of the Habeas Corpus Act; she purified the elective franchise; she repealed the Perpetual Mutiny Bill and placed on record the immortal resolve that a standing army in time of peace, without the consent of Parliament, was contrary to law.

All these splendid acquisitions she obtained in 1782, after a short reign, by means of her Parliament, freed from English control and influenced by Irish feelings and Irish counsels. Subsequently, after a severe struggle against a corrupt court, she obtained a Navigation Act, a Pension Bill, a Place Bill and a Responsibility Bill. She diffused the spirit of religious liberty and emancipated, in a degree, the mind of her people. She repealed numerous penal laws and gave to Roman Catholics property and power, and accom-

panied the possession of land with the right of the elective franchise. She opened to the Catholics the Bar and the Assistant Barristers' Bench; and if she had not been thwarted by British influence she would have given them full and complete emancipation and placed in every respect the Roman Catholic on an equality with his Protestant fellow countryman.

England had rights and precedents of her own to follow. She could boast of a proud constitutional ancestry who traced their names—their descent, their glories—in hereditary succession to the Great Charters of their country that they had thirty times confirmed. But no such advantages were possessed by Ireland, where it might be said Ireland had to create almost everything, and to create it out of chaos.

It was a Godlike work, and, like the Divine Creation, required fiends to destroy it.⁴ This constitutional era in Irish history, the only bright period in her melancholy political life since the English conquest, lasted eighteen years. During this period England had lost her American colonies, France had abolished the sway of the Bourbons, while her royalty, her nobility of title and of robe perished under the knife of the guillotine. Continental Europe armed in defense of Divine right, but her well equipped armies were repulsed from French soil by the sans-culotte conscripts of Republican France. Napoleon's star had arisen!

Ireland for centuries had been held and governed to a great extent as a conquered country. Here is the proof from official tables. As early as 1682 the estates of absentee owners aggregated nearly a million acres, lying in the best parts of the kingdom, whose owners, living in England, rarely if ever set foot on Irish soil. All these estates yielded to their English owners in the aggregate less than a million dollars a year, a proof that their agents had a rich perquisite in their fiduciary incumbency, while the lands presented a beggarly and miserable appearance. Fifty years later their income had increased to \$3,350,000, while in 1782 Mr. Arthur Young gave the absentee drain from Ireland as over \$11,000,000 a year. In 1805 this drain was estimated at \$15,000,000, while in 1828 it amounted to more than \$20,000,000 a year.

Some of these absentee holdings aggregated as high as 50,000 acres. Travelers might pass through the fairest parts of Ireland and for an entire day not see the abode of a single resident gentleman, while the occupants of the soil, whenever seen, presented a wild and wretched appearance.

The great majority of the Irish people were of the peasant classes, whose social condition under the prevailing absentee landlord

⁴ Grattan, V., pp. 185, et. seq.

régime was probably worse than that of any similar class in Europe. Their land holdings were small, while the annual result of their toil did not always satisfy the exactions of the agents of the landlords and the tithe proctors. Their dwellings, as a rule, were poor, while their habiliment did not protect its wearer during bad seasons. What was worse, the failure of crops during a bad season occasionally resulted in a period of semi-starvation.

But these poor people of Ireland, living under the alien rule of the conqueror of the kingdom, had, however, clung to the faith of their forefathers. Their firm adherence thereto had rendered them odious in the eyes of the "No Popery" government of England, which cared but little about their condition; but their sublime reverence for the Christian laws in which they had been reared and their submission to the Omnipotent, in sunshine or in gloom, restrained passion and made them reconciled to their wretched condition.

The Roman Catholic hierarchy, filling the seats of a prelacy which was founded by Saint Patrick and which had succeeded in unbroken line through ages of persecution without the taint of heresy, was, as a class, among the most distinguished of the mitred heads of the Catholic Church. They usually aggregated thirty prelates, which at all times had included a fair representation of the noble Catholic families of the Island of Saints.

The average number of the clergy of all classes was apparently about 2,500. As a rule they were highly educated men who led saintly lives, who were capable of associating with the most refined and intelligent families in the kingdom, while they sincerely sympathized with and zealously guarded the spiritual interests of the masses of the Irish Catholic people. It may be asked, how, prior to the foundation of the Irish Catholic ecclesiastical college of Maynooth, such a prelacy and such a priesthood had been maintained? Here is the answer: Prior to the French Revolution 478, mostly Irish, Catholic ecclesiastical students were educated in Catholic universities on the continent of Europe. This was the yearly aggregate average. These institutions were in France, Belgium, Portugal, Spain and in Rome; and those of them whose foundations had not been sequestered during revolutionary convulsions exist at the present day.

Of the aggregate average, 420 received gratuitous education, while 58 were educated at the expense of the Catholic nobility and of the wealthy merchants of Ireland. While 2,500 priests were required for parochial work, deaths, inability and casualties required an annual supplement of 300. Catholic families in both kingdoms maintaining chapels, as has always been customary, were supplied with chaplains from these sources.

Besides the hereditary Catholic noble families whose sons were debarred by penal laws from professional careers in their native land, who offered their swords to the Catholic rulers of Europe, and under whose auspices they won high honors and military renown and formed matrimonial alliances with distinguished families whose Irish names and great wealth are in evidence at the present day in Austria, France, Portugal and Spain, there was another distinct class of smart men such as in France are known as the *bourgeois*—men of capacity who were possessed of wealth, prominent factors in the banking, the commercial and the manufacturing interests; who were steadfast Catholics and reliable friends of the members of the Irish hierarchy and priesthood in their respective localities.

These were mostly identified with the cities and seaport towns of Ireland. They developed and enlarged the manufactures and commerce of the kingdom, but they had been hampered and restricted in this direction by the jealousy of their English competitors. If their woolen fabrics, for instance, excelled in quality and found more ready sale in the English markets than the English goods, an embargo was asked for on their shipment and granted by the British Parliament, and Irish woollens were excluded from English competition. So it was with other lines of Irish goods competing with English manufactures. The linen trade alone of the North of Ireland, with which the English could not compete, held its sway.

In the seaport towns a large export and import trade with the colonies flourished.

Irish ships freighted with provisions, fat cattle, and carrying passengers, sailed regularly for Quebec and returned with cargoes of timber and other colonial products.

The capital required for this commerce was large, but it was always available for legitimate requirements, as there were many eminent and wealthy firms of bankers in Dublin as well as in the seaport cities ready to encourage this trade.

It is not, however, an agreeable task to review the social status of these respectable, these eminent and these wealthy *bourgeois* of the commercial Irish classes of that period. In their homes, in their family life, there was refinement; there was among their class social enjoyment.

The heads of families sent their sons and daughters to the continent to be educated, and to pursue such careers of active or spiritual life as their talents or inclinations favored. In their native homes they were debarred social recognition. They were Papists! They were declassed, relegated to an inferior sphere of social life. In the important towns, long before America knew the meaning of the

term, there were *boards of trade*, whose merchants daily assembled to consult about business affairs.

But in these commercial conclaves a Catholic member, being a Papist, had no standing, although his *cheque* upon the leading local bank might be good for a half million of dollars. He was a Papist! To illustrate: In the board of trade of the city of Galway, which was of ancient origin, which opened at 10 A. M. and closed at 2 P. M., where large transactions were of daily occurrence, there entered one day a Galway merchant of great wealth, who was highly esteemed by his fellow-townsmen.

Under the No Popery regime, in the Galway board of trade meetings, the Protestant members were allowed to wear their hats, while Catholics were obliged to remove their head covering. The merchant referred to above sauntered into the Galway chamber of commerce, ruminating on the operation he had in view, forgetting that he was a Roman Catholic, when he was reminded of this fact by a burly non-Catholic, who knocked off his hat, with the remark that Papists could not wear them on the Galway board of trade. The merchant quietly picked up his hat and retired from the chamber.

At the period of the constitutional victory won by Irish non-Catholics from England in 1782 there remained on Irish soil 44 monuments to the memory of the ancient Church of Ireland. These comprised 25 abbatial structures, including cloisters, friaries, monasteries and priories, most of which were of great extent and of solid stone, cut and ornamented with the chisel of skilled artisans, whose work seemed imperishable, and 19 cathedrals and churches, many of great extent, whose fine outlines gave testimony of the grandeur and magnificent ceremonial of the Irish Church in mediæval times. It was not alone the architectural perfection, exquisite in all the minute details of these structures, which excited admiration, but it was the localities, with one notable exception, in which they had been erected. Ireland abounds in landscape beauty; charming lakes, islands, headlands and valleys were chosen by the eminent saints and churchmen when selecting a site on which a structure was to be reared in honor of Almighty God.

The exception noted above was the Cathedral of Saint Patrick, which had been erected on the summit of the Rock of Cashel, miles above the level of its picturesque surroundings.

It was a cathedral of vast extent and of great architectural perfection.

It was surrounded with strategic defensive protection which served to render its position, in a military point of view, impregnable.

The original structure was destroyed in the fifteenth century, but rebuilt on a more grand and elaborate scale. A century and a half

ago this magnificent monument to Irish Catholic history, in which five centuries previously many great councils had been held, presided over by Papal nuncios, which had remained practically intact, was doomed to destruction by the Anglican Archbishop Price, who had been appointed to the archiepiscopal see in 1744; as this Protestant functionary could not drive in his carriage to the Cathedral door on account of the steep ascent, he procured from the Irish Parliament an act to remove the See to the town of Cashel. He then had the roof of the grand old pile stripped of its leaden covering and the lead sent to Dublin and sold; the Cathedral of St. Patrick was then abandoned to ruin by the elements. The adjoining churches were of great architectural beauty and were roofed with stone.

The massive walls of the grand old Cathedral of St. Patrick, with its castellated surroundings, with its suggestive memories, stand on the summit of huge limestone rocks, in the midst of one of the most luxurious regions in all Ireland, the "Golden Vale."⁵

The status of the Catholics of Ireland was set forth in a petition to George III, 1793, which recites: We are interdicted from all municipal stations, and the franchise of all guilds and corporations; which establishes a species of monopoly uniformly operating in our disfavor!

We may not found nor endow any university, college or school for the education of our children; and we are interdicted from obtaining degrees from the University of Dublin by the several charters and statutes now in force therein!

We are totally prohibited from keeping weapons for self-defense of our houses, families or persons. Any magistrate may compel a Catholic, be he peer or peasant, to come forward and convict himself of keeping arms for his defense; refusal to do so involves fine and imprisonment, the pillory and whipping!

No Catholic has his property secure. The law allows a son to turn Protestant and deprive his father of his real and personal property.

Catholics are excluded from all petit juries in civil actions, where one of the parties is a Protestant. And further excluded from trials of cases under the anti-Popery laws.

We can only serve on grand juries when there is not to be found a sufficiency of Protestants to complete the panel, which seldom if ever happens.

We pass over inferior grievances to state one great incapacity, which we claim to be a badge of unmerited ignominy. We are deprived of the elective franchise!

We are taxed without representation thereby, and otherwise humiliated and disgraced.⁶

⁵ "Ireland, Its Scenery, Character," etc., by Mr. and Mrs. S. C. Hall. Vol. II., pp. 106, 107.

⁶ Plowden, II., 275.

When England had recovered from her temporary embarrassment, after the loss of her American colonies, her statesmen found themselves face to face with the quasi independence of the Parliament of Ireland.

Then was commenced the work of the demoralization of that Parliament as a prelude to its destruction. Then originated the plans for wiping out the autonomy of the sister kingdom, by corrupting her legislature and incorporating Ireland into the English realm. England sent her Viceroys to Dublin tutored with her ultimate designs. Some of these officials, too honorable to play the part of corruptionists, resigned.

Through the means of the borough system, the suffrages of the patrons of these boroughs, either by money, by titles or by fat offices, were obtained. The most able, the most unscrupulous, as well as the most lavish, of the Vice Regal officials was Lord Castlereagh! He was given *carte blanche* power, and his success forms a melancholy chapter in Irish history.

The work the Irish patriots had accomplished for the freedom of the Irish nation was destroyed during the most shameful process recorded in constitutional history. Finally, during the first year of the nineteenth century, Castlereagh secured control of enough votes in both houses of the Parliament of Ireland to carry the act of Union by which the autonomy of the kingdom of Ireland was wiped out of existence. In the "Red List" will be found the names of the Irish members who could not be corrupted; in the Black List the shameful record of those who sold their votes and the price paid these recreants. It is an interesting study. It is consoling, however, to reflect that no Roman Catholic had a share in this disgraceful proceeding, and that very few of the names which appear in the "Black List" indicate pure Hibernian lineage.

The policy of the government and the efforts of their supporters was to foment fresh divisions and increase those that already existed among the various parties that composed the Irish community; nor were those arts practiced upon the Catholics only; the Orangemen were also applied to; but the Grand Orange Lodge of Ireland was induced to issue a circular to their brethren, advising the determination not to discuss the question of Union and recommending the same course to all other lodges. This was done at the suggestion, it was said, of Mr. Beresford and Mr. Verner, the principal leaders of that body. The result was that many of the lodges and the Orangemen throughout the country remained silent; and though sworn and bound by their oaths to uphold the constitution, *they beheld in silence its violation*. The Grand Lodge of the County of Antrim made a similar declaration; they declined to enter into the question, and

advised their brethren to adopt the same course. Notwithstanding this, thirty-two Orange Lodges in the counties of Down and Antrim alone agreed to resolutions disapproving of these instructions and declaring their right to discuss the question of Union.⁷

Many of these bodies assembled in various parts of Ireland in the months of February and March, 1800; though late in the field, they acted in a manner highly creditable, and adopted resolutions full of spirit and nationality. Examples are cited which indirectly disclose how, at the opening of the eighteenth century, all Ireland was permeated with organized bodies of men *opposed to the Catholic religion*, whose oaths made them the foes not only of the Catholic faith, but also of the four millions or more of Irish people professing that faith throughout the nation. The examples cited from among the thirty-two lodges referred to are designated by numbers only, without stating localities. Two read as follows:

Lodge No. 986. We are of opinion that a Legislative Union with Great Britain is a measure subversive of our happy constitution as established in 1782, and destructive to the trade and prosperity of Ireland.

Lodge No. 989. We declare in our opinion the proposed measure of an incorporate Union is destructive of our rights, liberties, trade and commerce. We will persevere, legally, in opposing so destructive a proposition.

Equally strong resolutions are cited by Grattan, from Lodges 596, 986, 641, 538, 497. The last quoted, from Lodge No. 651, reads as follows:

"That we see with unspeakable sorrow an attempt made to deprive Ireland of her constitution, of her trade; to seriously menace her present prosperity; to dwarf her national exertions and to reduce her to the degrading condition of a colony of England!"

In connection with the efforts of Castlereagh to obtain endorsement for the proposed act of Union, a study of the following record will be found interesting:

At a General Meeting of the Roman Catholics of the city of Waterford and its vicinity, 28 June, 1799, Peter St. Leger, Esq., in the chair:

The following were appointed a committee to prepare a Declaration on the measure of a Legislative Union: Rev. Dr. Thomas Hearn, Thomas Sherlock, Esq., Edward Shiel, Esq., Jeremiah Ryan, Esq., Thomas Hearn, Esq., M. D.

Resolved, That the following Declaration be adopted: The measure of a Legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland having been recommended to the consideration of both his parliaments by our most gracious Sovereign, the common father of his people; we, his Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Catholics of the city of Waterford and its vicinity, have thought it incumbent upon us to make this public avowal of our sentiments on this important and interesting occasion.

We are firmly convinced that a complete and entire Union between Great Britain and Ireland, founded on equal and liberal principles, and on a sense of mutual interests and affections, is a measure of wisdom and expediency

⁷ Grattan, Vol. V., p. 55.

for this kingdom, and will effectually promote the strength and prosperity of both, and we trust it will afford the surest means of allaying those unhappy distractions, and removing those penal exclusions on the score of religion, which have too long prevailed in this country, and by consolidating the resources of both kingdoms, oppose the most effectual resistance to the destructive projects of both foreign and domestic enemies.

Strongly impressed with these sentiments, we look forward with earnest anxiety to the moment when the two sister nations may be inseparably united in the full enjoyment of the blessings of a free constitution, in the support of the honor and dignity of his Majesty's crown, and in the preservation and advancement of the welfare and prosperity of the whole British empire. Resolved unanimously, That Lord Viscount Donoughmore, the sincere and attached friend of the Catholics of Ireland, be requested to communicate these our sentiments most respectfully to his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant.

[Signed.]

PETER ST. LEGER, Chairman.

Dublin Castle, July 16, 1799.

My Lord: I am directed by my Lord Lieutenant to request your Lordship will have the goodness to express to the Roman Catholics of Waterford the satisfaction his Excellency feels from their declaration of the 20th of June, which they desired your Lordship to lay before him and which is so respectfully signed.

The measure of a Legislative Union, upon just and liberal principles, between this kingdom and Great Britain is near his Excellency's heart; he is convinced that nothing will so effectually tend to bury the religious animosities in oblivion which have unhappily prevailed in this kingdom—to conciliate the affections of all his Majesty's subjects to the mild government under which they live—to increase the happiness and prosperity of Ireland—and to augment the power and stability of the British empire. I have the honor to be, with the truest esteem and regard, your Lordship's most obedient humble servant,

CASTLEREAGH,

Lord Viscount Donoughmore.

Cork, 5th August, 1799.

My Lord: Having had this day the honour to receive from your Lordship, and to lay before my Lord Lieutenant, the unanimous address of the Roman Catholic inhabitants of the towns of Tipperary, Cahir and their vicinities, I am commanded by his Excellency to express to them, through your Lordship, the pleasure he derives from the strong expressions of loyalty to his Majesty therein mentioned.

His Excellency enjoins me to add that the primary aim of his administration is to consolidate the strength and resources of this kingdom with those of Great Britain, and by an irrevocable bond of amity and affection to fix the connection upon one solid and indissoluble basis. Persuaded that these essentials can only be effected by a Legislative Union, in which the interests, the property and happiness of the whole empire are materially involved, your Lordship will have the goodness to convey to the respectable Roman Catholics of the towns of Tipperary, Cahir and their vicinities the gratification their unanimous declaration in favor of this measure has afforded him. I have the honor to be, etc.,

E. B. LITTLEHALES,

Lord Viscount Donoughmore.

The British Government had again sought to obtain an influence over the Roman Catholic hierarchy in the interest of British rule in Ireland. Having failed to wipe out the ancient faith of the Irish people, by the most cruel penal laws and by continued persecution, a policy of intrigue was commenced.⁸

As early as 1782 this government laid its plans to control the nomination of the Irish Catholic Bishops, offering for this privilege a mitigation of the application of the penal laws against the professors of the Catholic religion.⁹ The intrigue in this direction having failed, it was deemed advisable to control the education of the Irish

⁸ Grattan, Vol. V., p. 370.

⁹ See extract from letter of Burke in Grattan, V., p. 371.

priesthood, and the college of Maynooth was founded, subsidized and its faculty organized for this purpose in 1795 by the Government.

In the meantime Lord Castlereagh, on the part of the Viceroy, formulated the plans by which it was intended to carry the act of Union, by which the Home Rule government of Ireland, with her Parliament, would be wiped out of existence.

Castlereagh proposed to the Catholic prelates that if they would cast their influence in favor of the measure and give England the right to veto the appointment of any Catholic bishop nominated, whose name was submitted, that might be deemed inimical to British interests, the Government, in consideration of such concessions, would by an act of Parliament endow the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland with yearly salaries as soon as the way seemed clear to do so.

It is doubtful if Lord Castlereagh, who was an unprincipled political trickster, had the remotest idea that he could induce the British Government to carry out the proposed plan of pensioning the Catholic priesthood of Ireland!

But as he was the prime minister of affairs under the Viceroy at Dublin Castle, credence was given by several prelates occupying high rank in the hierarchy of the Catholic Church in Ireland, who, in consideration, sought to influence public opinion in favor of the act of Union.

They soon found, however, that the great majority of the intelligent Roman Catholics of Ireland were decidedly opposed to the extinction of the Irish Parliament and of the amalgamation of the kingdom with England. The course taken by the prelates was as follows:

At a meeting of the Roman Catholic prelates held in Dublin on the 17th, 18th and 19th of January, 1799, to deliberate on a proposal from government for an independent provision for the Roman Catholic clergy of Ireland under certain regulations not incompatible with their doctrines, discipline or just influence—it was admitted:

First. That a provision through government for the Roman Catholic clergy of this kingdom, competent and secured, ought to be thankfully accepted.

Second. That in the appointment of the prelates of the Roman Catholic religion to vacant sees within the kingdom, such interference of government as may enable it to be satisfied of the loyalty of the person to be appointed is just, and ought to be agreed to.

Third. That to give this principle its full operation without infringing the discipline of the Roman Catholic Church, or diminishing the religious influence which prelates of that Church ought justly to possess over their respective flocks, the following regulations seem necessary:

Fourth. In the vacancy of a see the clergy to recommend, as usual, a candidate to the prelates of the ecclesiastical province, who elect him or any other they may think more worthy, by a majority of suffrages—in the case of equality of suffrages, the presiding metropolitan to have a casting vote.

Fifth. The candidates so elected to be presented by the president (the chairman) of the election to government, which, within one month after such presentation, will transmit the name of said candidate, *if no objection be made against him*, for appointment to the Holy See, or return the said name to the president of the election for such transmission as may be agreed upon.

Sixth. If government have any proper objections against such candidates, the president of the election will be informed thereof within one month after presentation,

who in that case will convene the electors and proceed to the election of another candidate.

Seventh. Agreeably to the discipline of the Roman Catholic Church, these regulations can have no effect without the sanction of the Holy See, which sanction the Roman Catholic prelates of this kingdom shall, as soon as may be, use their endeavors to procure.

Eighth. The prelates are satisfied that the nomination of the parish priests, with a certificate of their having taken the oath of allegiance, be certified to government.

[Signed.]

Richard O'Reilly, R. C. A. B., Armagh (Primate).

J. J. Troy, R. C. A. B., Dublin.

Edward Dillon, R. C. A. B., Tuam.

Thomas Bray, R. C. A. B., Cashel.

P. J. Plunket, R. C. B., Meath.

F. Moylan, R. C. B., Cork.

Daniel Delaney, R. C. B., Kildare.

Edmund French, R. C. B., Elphin.

James Caulfield, R. C. B., Ferns.

John Cruise, R. C. B., Ardagh.

Dublin, 28 January, 1799.

The prelates, assembled to deliberate on a proposal from government of a provision for the clergy, have agreed that Most Rev. Dr. O'Reilly, Most Rev. Dr. Troy, Right Rev. Dr. Plunket, and such other of the prelates who *may be in town*, be commissioned to transact all business with government relative to the said proposal, under the substance of the regulations agreed on and subscribed by them.

This was a plausible and a tempting proposition to the Irish hierarchy, shrewdly extended by Lord Castlereagh. Ostensibly it meant the partial lifting from the impoverished people of all Ireland of the support of 2,500 Catholic priests.

But behind the scheme was the Government tutelage of the Bishops and priests of the kingdom, who were to be held under control of the Government, as are the Bishops and *curés* of France at the present day. Providentially this attempt was a failure.

It is probable that this action on the part of a moiety of the Irish hierarchy was influenced by the Most Rev. Dr. Troy, whose pro-British proclivity then, and subsequently, is a historical fact. He was *persona-grata* at the Castle. He had considerable influence at Rome, which resulted in the appointment of the two first bishops of New York.

He would have extended his influence more generally in the United States had not Bishop Carroll covered the ground and, with the coöperation of the Sulpitian doctors from Paris, built up the foundation of the American hierarchy.

At Rome Dr. Troy induced the Holy See to appoint Rev. Edmund Burke, an Irish priest, vicar general and missionary of all Western Canada. He was clothed with great jurisdiction, independent of the Canadian hierarchy.

Father Burke came to the frontier of Michigan at the time the American forces had acquired control of the north littoral of the boundary line between the River Raisin and Lake St. Clair.

In this region, which was all American, he made himself obnoxious by his pro-British proclivities; imagining his life was in danger, he

went to Nova Scotia, where he subsequently became bishop. Dr. Shea states he was a man of some ability.

But the veto measure had not been abandoned by the British Government.

It was a pet scheme of Castlereagh. Right Reverend Dr. Milner, an English Roman Catholic prelate, was induced to revive the scheme in 1808.

His efforts to obtain the suffrages of the Irish hierarchy in its favor were thwarted by the eminent Catholic historian, Dr. Lingard. In the month of September, 1809, the Catholic prelates of Ireland, at a meeting in Dublin, resolved:

That it was their decided opinion that it was inexpedient to introduce any alteration in the canonical mode hitherto observed in the nomination of the Roman Catholic Bishops, which mode long experience had proved to be unexceptionable, wise and salutary.

They followed this by another resolution pledging themselves to recommend only such persons as were of unimpeachable loyalty and peaceable conduct for the hierarchy. This was signed by twenty-three Bishops. There were only three dissentients, namely, Most Rev. Dr. Troy and two other prelates who had signed the resolutions of 1799.

For this proceeding they received the thanks of the Catholics in various parts of Ireland, for the laity had in the meantime taken a decided part against the "Veto."¹⁰ But Castlereagh, who was the father of the "Veto," had not given up his fight for the control of the Irish hierarchy. After the battle of Waterloo and the eclipse of Napoleon he played his last stake and won, as he believed, his victory over the Irish Bishops.

He appealed to Cardinal Consalvi, Secretary of State of the Holy See, to coerce the obedience of the prelates of Ireland in favor of the proposition of the British Government. This Cardinal, considering that the rehabilitation of the Pontificate in the Roman States was due in a great measure to the power of England, knowing very little, it is presumed, about the Irish hierarchy, was only too willing to please Castlereagh. Moreover he (Consalvi) it was who, on the part of the Holy See, had negotiated with Napoleon the Concordat of 1801, which gave to the ruler of France the nomination of seventy or more Bishops and 40,000 *curés*. He could not see any great evil to the Catholic religion in Ireland by acceding to the wishes of the British Government. He accordingly on the part of the Holy See formulated an edict directed to the Irish hierarchy through the primate, commanding in general terms their adhesion, in fact, their submission, to the British Government the

¹⁰ Grattan, V., p. 379.

right of the latter to object to the nomination of their Bishops. This was Castlereagh's last trump card. But the Irish prelates paid no attention to the edict of Cardinal Consalvi. The "Veto" question after thirty-three years' agitation was finally laid to rest.

The Confederacy of the United Irishmen was the greatest political organization leagued for a patriotic purpose known in modern history. The scandalous misrule of Lord Castlereagh during the last decade of the eighteenth century had inspired a majority of the leading men of the Irish nation to follow the example of the American colonies and to emancipate Ireland from British rule. The outbreak of the French Revolution warmed the hearts and encouraged the hopes of the Irish patriots. The ablest and purest minded men in the kingdom united to devise the mechanism of the organization, and so skillfully was their work accomplished that the elite of the educated classes and business men, regardless of religious affinity or of family connection, became members of the great Confederacy. Its centre was in Dublin, but it was powerful in Belfast and popular in all the cities and towns of the kingdom. Theobald Wolf Tone and others were sent to Paris to solicit aid from France and succeeded. But Almighty God had other designs for the future of the "Islands of Saints."

The fleets carrying the armies of the French Republic, which had they landed would have changed the destiny of Ireland and probably of England, too, were dispersed by storms off the Irish coast; and, except for a small contingent which was landed, returned to France. This great feature of the rebellion of the United Irishmen was apparently thwarted by the interference of Divine Providence.

The leaders of the Confederacy now had recourse to the half million of stalwart Irish peasants who had been enrolled and drilled in nocturnal exercises, but who were without arms and competent officers. But in the meantime the secret of the Confederacy, the names of its leaders in Dublin and elsewhere and of its designs had been sold by a Dublin merchant named Reynolds to Lord Castlereagh. This recreant, with the large amount of his blood money, hastily left the kingdom. His purchaser now had the whole framework of the Confederacy of the United Irishmen at his disposal. It is said he was cold-blooded enough to allow the patriots to mature their plans, so that while Ireland was in the throes of an abortive rebellion he could carry through the Irish Parliament the infamous Act of Union, by which Ireland with her independent autonomy was absorbed into the English Commonwealth.

In the meantime troops were rushed over to Ireland. A contingent of brutal Hessian soldiers were added to the red coats, while all the Orange militia that could be relied upon were uni-

formed, armed and enrolled in regiments. Then Castlereagh let the havoc commence. What followed was not a civil war; it had more of the features of a brutal race war, in which the Irish peasants, "at length," prepared by the sufferings and indignities of centuries, listened with sanguine or desperate credulity to the counsel which reminded them of their strength and directed them to employ it in one furious effort which, whether it failed or prospered, could not embitter their condition. "The spirit of the Government," continues William Henry Curran in his father's biography, "found a ready and a fatal coöperation in the gentry of the land. Never was there a class of men less amenable to the lessons of experience.

Others filled their places who developed the plan of buying, Adversity, the great instructor of the wise, brought to them all the afflictions without their antidote. Every fierce, inveterate resentment of the race lineally descended with the title deeds from the father to the son. Year after year the landlord's house was fired, his stock was plundered, his rent unpaid, his land a waste, and each succeeding year he was seen effecting his escape through scenes of turbulence and danger, from his estate to the capital, to make his periodical complaint of his sufferings and to give the minister another vote for their continuance. "The Irish landlord," continues Mr. Curran, "of the last century was the great inciter to insurrection. With a nominal superiority of rank and education he was in every ferocious propensity upon a level with the degraded dependants whom he affected to condemn and whose passions he vainly labored to control, because he had never set them the example of controlling his own. Finding his efforts abortive, he next vindictively debased them, and the consequence was that in a little time he shared the same fate with his victims. The condition of Ireland during the eighteenth century affords a striking and melancholy example of the certain retribution with which a system of misrule will visit those who so mistake their own interests as to give it their support. An inconsiderable order or a single sect may (however unjustly) be degraded with impunity; but the degradation of the mass of a nation will inevitably recoil upon its oppressors. The consequences may not always be visible in formidable acts of force, but there is a silent and unerring retaliation in the effects upon morals and manners by which the tyrant is made eventually to atone for his crimes. In highly polished states they may be observed descending from the higher to the inferior ranks. The courtesy and humanity of the old French peer were found to give a tinge to the conversation of the mechanic. In uncivilized communities the progress is the reverse; the rudeness of the boor will ascend and taint the master. The latter was the case in Ireland. The Irish

peasant in his intercourse with his superiors saw nothing of which the imitation could soften and improve him. The gentry, although conscious that their religion and the violent means by which so many of them had acquired their properties excited the suspicion and aversion of those below them, resorted to every infallible method of confirming these hostile impressions.

Instead of endeavoring to eradicate them by mildness and protection, they insulted and oppressed. Every district presented scenes of turbulent contention in which the haughty lord lost whatever dignity he had possessed and finally became infected with the barbarous passions and manners of the vassals whom he had disdained to civilize till he required as much to be civilized himself.¹¹

The supreme struggle was short, while the suppression of the rebellion was attended with great slaughter and devastation. The number of the patriots who perished in conflict, on the scaffold or who were exiled exceeded 50,000. The loss of life on the part of the English side reached 20,000.

During the first months of the conflict sixty-nine Roman Catholic churches were raided and destroyed. In the counties of Dublin, Ferns and Wexford the aggregate was fifty-nine, while in other counties it was ten, while the houses of the priests, school buildings and parish dependencies exceeding these numbers were either ruined or demolished. These facts are on record, for the Government was obliged to make good the respective losses. But what scenes of horror had ensued! The social condition of the Roman Catholics during the last year of the eighteenth century was lamentable. The cities, towns and villages were garrisoned mostly by Orange militiamen, while among the county sheriffs and other local officials were to be found some of the most brutal "No Popery" haters in the British Empire.¹²

Although, remarks the conservative historian Plowden, by no official act were the picketings, stranglings, floggings and torturings to extort confessions justified or sanctioned, yet it is universally known that under the very eye of government, *and with more than their tacit permission*, were these outrages practised, in defiance of the constitution as admitted by all, in defiance of humanity and policy as maintained by most men.

In Beresford's Riding House, Sandy's Prevot, the Old Custom House, the Royal Exchange, some of the barracks and other places in Dublin there were daily, hourly notorious exhibitions of these

¹¹ "The Life of the Right Honorable John Philpot Curran," by his son, William Henry Curran, with additions and notes by R. Shelton Mackenzie, D. C. L. 244 et. seq.

¹² Plowden, II., p. 299.

torturings, as there also were in almost every town, village or hamlet throughout the kingdom in which troops were quartered. An example is recorded when the sheriff of Clonmel ordered a Catholic citizen of standing and of means *to be given 500 lashes*, and kept him confined three days, so that his wounds could not receive attention. His offense was that a letter in French of innocent purport was found in his possession.¹³

While Catholic Ireland was still bleeding; while the smoke of devastation of churches and peasants' homes still obscured the atmosphere; while torturing the members of prominent Catholic families was of daily occurrence; while the prisons were filled with accused patriots too numerous to face the courts; while the "British guillotine," the hangman's rope, consigned the unfortunate victims condemned by biased judges and packed juries to eternity on the scaffold, Lord Castlereagh was busy formulating his plans for extinguishing constitutional liberty in Ireland by passing an act of Union with England. He found that money down, titles of nobility, salaried offices of every kind, including Bishops, might be employed in purchasing enough votes in the Irish House of Parliament to carry the act of Union.

The most distinguished of the Protestant talent in the House fought the measure step by step. Their eloquent speeches fell lifeless upon the minds of men who had been corrupted. The *Red List* gives the names of the incorruptible patriots of Ireland, while the *Black List* gives the names, together with the price paid by Castlereagh.

THE ORIGINAL RED LIST.

Of the Members of the Irish House of Commons who voted against the Union in 1799 and 1800:

Acheson, Hon. A., son of Lord Gosford.
 Alcock, William C., County Wexford.
 Archdall, Mervyn, County Fermanagh.
 Armstrong, William H., refused all government offers.
 Burrowes, Peter, subsequently Judge.
 Ball, John, member for Drogheda; incorruptible.
 Ball, Charles, brother of the above.
 Barrington, Sir Jonah, Judge in admiralty.
 Bushe, Charles, afterwards Chief Justice.
 Blakeney, William.
 Burton, William.
 Brooke, Henry V.
 Balfour, Blaney.
 Babbington, David, related to Lord Belmore.
 Barry, Col. I. Maxwell, Lord Farnham.
 Corry, Viscount, Lord Belmore, vigorous opponent.
 Clements, Lord, subsequently Lord Leitrim.
 Cole, Hon. Lowry, a general.
 Caulfield, Lord, subsequently Earl of Charlemont.
 Coddington, Henry.
 Crookshank, George.

¹³ Plowden, II., 711 et. seq.

Daly, Dennis B.
Dalway, Noah.
Dawson, Arthur.
Dawson, Richard.
Dobbs, Francis, famous author.
Egan, Francis, King's Counsel.
Edgeworth, Richard L.
Evans, George.
Freke, Sir John, subsequently Lord Carberry.
Falkiner, Frederick.
Fitzgerald, Right Hon. J.
Foster, Right Hon. J., Speaker of the House.
Foster, Hon. Thomas.
Gorges, Hamilton, incorruptible, though poor.
Grattan, Henry.
Goold, Thomas.
Hamilton, Hans.
Hardman, Edward.
Hardy, Francis, author.
Hoare, Sir Joseph.
Hoare, Edward, very old and stone blind.
Hoare, Hume.
Hoare, Bartholomew, King's Counsel.
Hamilton, Alexander, King's Counsel.
Hamilton, Hon. A. C.
Irwin, Henry.
King, Charles.
King, Gilbert.
King, Hon. Robert.
King, Major.
King, Right Hon. Henry.
Kingsborough, Lord, Earl of Kingston.
Knox, Hon. George.
Lambert, Gustavus.
Latouche, David, Jr., banker.
Latouche, John, Sr., banker.
Latouche, John, Jr., banker.
Latouche, Robert, banker.
Lee, Edward.
Leighton, Sir Thomas, Baronet, banker.
Leslie, Charles Powell.
Maxwell, Lord.
Macartney, Sir J., Baronet.
Montgomery, Alexander.
Moore, Arthur.
Moore, John.
Mathew, Lord, Earl of Landaff.
Mahon, Thomas.
Metge, John.
Newenham, Thomas, author.
O'Brien, Sir Edward, Clare County.
O'Callaghan, Hon. W.
O'Donnell, James Moore.
O'Donnell, Colonel Hugh.
Ogle, Right Hon. George.
Osborn, Henry.
Parnell, Henry.
Parnell, Sir John, Chancellor of the Exchequer, dismissed for his vote by Castlereagh.
Parsons, Sir Lawrence, Earl of Rosse.
Plunket, Lord W. C.
Ponsonby, George, subsequently Lord Ponsonby.
Ponsonby, James B., subsequently Lord Ponsonby.
Ponsonby, Right Hon., subsequently Lord Chancellor.
Ponsonby, General W., killed at Waterloo.
Power, Richard.
Preston, Joseph.
Rochfort, John S.
Relly, William E.
Richardson, Sir William.
Ruxton, Charles.
Ruxton, William P.
Sauderson, Francis.
Savage, Francis.

Saurin, Right Hon. William, subsequently Attorney General.
 Saint George, Sir R., Baronet.
 Shaw, Robert, banker.
 Skeffington, Hon. W. J.
 Stewart, Henry.
 Stewart, James.
 Smyth, William.
 Sneyd, Nathaniel.
 Synge, Francis.
 Taylor, John.
 Taylor, Hon. R.
 Tighe, Henry.
 Tighe, John.
 Townsend, Thomas.
 Vereker, later Lord Gort.
 Waller, John.
 Westby, Nicholas.
 Whaley, Thomas.
 Wolfe, Colonel John, deprived of his commission.
 Wynne, Owen.

ORIGINAL BLACK LIST.

Those who voted for the Union :

Aldridge, R., imported for the purpose.
 Alexander, Henry. His own brother made a bishop and himself Colonial Secretary Cape of Good Hope.
 Archdall, Richard, made a commissioner.
 Bailey, William, similar reward.
 Beresford, Right Hon. J., First Commissioner of Revenue, brother-in-law of Lord Clare.
 Beresford, J., Junior, made Lord Decies.
 Beresford, Marcus, made Colonel in the army.
 Bingham, J., made a peer and paid \$115,000, with the title of Lord Clanmorris.
 Blake, Joseph H., created Lord Wallscourt, etc.
 Blackwood, Sir J. J., created Lord Dufferin.
 Blaquiére, Sir John, offices and pensions and created Lord de Blaquiére.
 Bagwell, John, Sr.,
 Bagwell, John, Jr.,
 Father and son, lucrative rewards.
 Botet, Anthony, made a commissioner, with \$400 a year.
 Burton, Colonel, commission in army.
 Butler, Sir Richard, purchased on private terms.
 Boyle, Lord, son of Lord Shannon. Father and son paid half a million dollars for seats and parliamentary boroughs.
 Brown, Right Hon. D., Lord Sligo's brother.
 Bruce, Stewart, official in Dublin Castle, made a Baronet.
 Burdet, George, a commissioner with \$2,500 a year.
 Bunbury, George, a similar reward.
 Browne, Arthur, renegaded, died soon afterwards.
 Cane, James, pensioned for his vote.
 Casey, Thomas, commissionership and salary.
 Castlereagh, the Irish Minister.
 Cavendish, George, and father, Sir Henry, well provided with salaried positions.
 Chinnery, Sir R., lucrative office.
 Cope, Colonel C., fat position.
 Cooke, made under secretary at Castle.
 Coote, Charles H., made Lord Castlecoote and given \$37,500 for his vote.
 Correy, Right Hon. Isaac, made Chancellor of the Exchequer, vice Sir John Parnell.
 Cotter, Sir John, vote purchased, terms private.
 Cotter, Richard, terms private.
 Creighton, Hon. H. } Votes purchased for
 Creighton, Hon. J. } money consideration, terms private.
 Craddock, General, created Lord Howden, with higher military rank.
 Crosby, James, made a colonel, with pecuniary reward for his vote.
 Crosbie, W. A., high office and salary.
 Cuppe, natural son of Mr. Cuppe, who was created Lord Tyrawley.
 Dunne, General, rewarded by high office.
 Elliott, G., Secretary at the Castle.

Eustace, General, given a regiment.
 Fitzgerald, Lord Charles, Duke of Leinster's brother, a pension and a peerage; he was a naval officer of no repute.
 Fergusson, Mr. A., given an office, \$2,500 a year, and made a baronet.
 Fortescue, Sir C., a lucrative office.
 Forward, Right Hon. W., Lord Wicklow's brother.
 Fox, Luke, related to Lord Ely, made a judge.
 Fortescue, William, pension \$15,000 a year.
 Galbraith, J., made a baronet.
 Grady, Henry D., made counsel to Commissioners.
 Hare, Richard, put two members into Parllament, created Lord Ennismore for their votes.
 Hare, William, son of the above.
 Hatton, George, made commissary of stamps.
 Handcock, William, made a peer, under scandalous circumstances.
 Henker, Colonel B., made a Lord and paid \$17,500.
 Hobson, John, lucrative office.
 Holmes, Peter, made Commissioner of Stamps.
 Howard, Hugh, Lord Wicklow's brother, made Postmaster General, large salary.
 Hutchinson, Hon. J., created Lord Hutchinson and made a general.
 Jackson, Colonel George, given a regiment.
 Jackson, brother of above, made a general.
 Jepson, Denham, lucrative appointment.
 Jocelyn, Hon. G., high military rank and his brother made Bishop of Lismore.
 Johnson, Robert, made a judge.
 Johnson, William, elected to Parllament by Lord Castlereagh, appointed Judge.
 Jones, Theophilus, made collector of Dublin.
 Jones, William, appointed colonel.
 Keane, John, pensioned.
 Kearney, James, attorney of Lord Clifton, an office.
 Kemmis, Henry, son of Crown Solicitor.
 Keatinge, Colonel.
 Knott, William, made Commissioner, \$4,000 a year.
 Knox, Andrew, Lord Abercorn's influence.
 Lake, General, an Englishman, elected by Lord Castlereagh to vote for the Union.
 Langrishe, Right Hon. Sir Hercules, an office and \$75,000 in money for his patronage.
 Latouche, Right Hon. David, banker.
 Lindsay, T., paid \$7,500 for his patronage.
 Lindsay, T., son of above, paid \$7,500 and given an office at the Castle.
 Longfield, T., created Lord Longueville.
 Longfield, Captain J., a lucrative office.
 Loftus, Lord, son of Lord Ely, Postmaster General. Father and son received \$150,000.
 Loftus, General, relative of above, a regiment.
 McNamara, Francis, a pension paid by Lord Castlereagh.
 Mahon, Ross, several places.
 Martin, Richard, Commissioner of Stamps.
 Massey, H. D., received \$20,000 for his vote.
 Mason, Right Hon. Monk, Commissioner of Revenue.
 Mason, Thomas.
 McNaughton, A. E., made Lord of the Treasury.
 Moore, Stephen, a postmaster at will.
 Moore, N. M.
 Morris, Right Hon. Lodge, created a peer.
 McClelland, James, Baron of the Exchequer.
 McDonnell, Colonel C. M., Commissioner, \$2,500 a year.
 McGennis, Richard, a similar position.
 Musgrave, Sir R., Receivership, \$6,000 a year.
 Nesbit, Thomas, pensioner at will.
 Newcommen, Sir William G., vote purchased by a peerage for his wife.
 Neville, Richard, Teller of the Exchequer.
 Odell, William, a regiment and made Lord of the Treasury.
 Ormsby, C. M., Council Commissioner.
 Packenham, Admiral, Master of the Ordnance.
 Packenham, Colonel, made a general (brother of above) and killed at New Orleans in battle against the Americans, commanded by his fellow-countryman, Andrew Jackson, subsequently President.
 Pensfather, R.
 Prendergast, T., he and his brother given offices of \$2,500 a year.

Prittle, H. S., created Lord Dunally.
 Quin, Sir Richard, created a Lord.
 Roche, Sir Boyle, gentleman usher at the Castle.
 Rowley, Hon. C., sold his vote for a high office.
 Rutledge, R.
 Sandford, H. M., created Lord Mount Sandford.
 Savage, James.
 Sharkey, Richard, appointed a county judge.
 Skeffington, Hon. H., a position and \$37,500 in money for his patronage.
 Smith, William, a barrister, appointed a Baron of the Exchequer.
 Stanley, Edmond, made Commissioner of Accounts.
 Staples, John.
 Stannus, Thomas, renegaded.
 Stewart, John, created a baronet and appointed Attorney General.
 Stratton, John.
 Stratford, Hon. B., paid \$37,500 compensation.
 Stratford, Hon. J., brother of above, made Paymaster of Foreign Forces,
 \$6,000 a year, and paid \$37,500 compensation.
 Toler, Right Hon. John, Attorney General, made Chief Justice and a Peer.
 Talbot, Richard.
 Trench, Frederick, Commissioner of Works.
 Trench, Charles, Commissioner of Inland Navigation, a new office created
 by Lord Cornwallis for reward.
 Trench, Hon. R., a barrister, created a peer and made an ambassador.
 Tottenham, Charles, in office.
 Tottenham, P., cousin of Lord Ely, compensated for patronage.
 Tyrone, Lord, proposed the Union in Parliament, and got 104 offices in the
gift of his family!
 Townsend, John, Commissioner.
 Tighe, Robert, Commissioner of Barracks.
 Uniac, Robert, related to Lord Clare, made a Commissioner.
 Verner, James, called the "Prince of Orange."
 Vandeleur, I. D., commissionership for himself and his brother made a
 judge.
 Weymiss, Colonel, Collector of Kilkenny.
 Westenra, Henry, father of Lord Rossmore, but the reverse of him in
 politics.

This *Black List* ends the disgraceful history of the destruction of the Parliament of Ireland by Lord Castlereagh.

It was the unfortunate country herself which had to bear the burden of the lavish use of money, the entail of the additions to the peerage and baronetage and the fat salaries of the bishops, judges, officers without number and places expressly made as a reward for votes. All of which was added to the bonded debt of Ireland. We might recall the words of Grattan "that this Constitutional Parliament was a Godlike work and required fiends to destroy it!"

RICHARD R. ELLIOTT.

THE TEACHING OF THE NEW TESTAMENT AND OF THE CHURCH REGARDING DIVORCE.

THE Catholic Church has always shown herself exceeding jealous of the sacredness of the matrimonial bond, and especially in these latter days her legislation on the subject of matrimony affords a striking contrast to the laxity of sectarian churches and to the deplorable ease with which divorces can now be obtained in the secular courts.

The Council of Trent may be taken as affording an index of the general teaching of the Church on the point. "If any one asserts that the Church errs or has erred when she teaches or has taught according to the doctrine of the Gospel and of the Apostle that the bond of matrimony cannot be dissolved by reason of the adultery of one of two married persons; and that neither of them, not even the innocent party who has not committed adultery, can marry again during the lifetime of the other; and that both he who puts away his adulterous wife and marries another commits adultery, as well also as the wife who leaves her husband by reason of his adultery—let him be anathema."

And in this decree the Council of Trent is but repeating the seventeenth canon of the Council of Mileris held under Pope Innocent I. in the year 416. "According to the doctrine of the Gospel and of the Apostle let neither the husband who is put away by his wife, nor the wife who is put away by her husband marry another, but let them remain as they are or be reconciled to one another."

These two decrees, separated from one another by a distance of eleven hundred years, bear witness to the unchanging nature of the Church's doctrine. But while the Church has thus stereotyped her teaching, a change has come over the non-Catholic world and divorce has become merely a question of money. At the same time it would be wrong to suppose that it was merely the secular courts which were lenient on the subject. Christian teachers, in spite of one or two earnest protests, all seem to hold that there are certain things which give a right to a divorce and that the remarriage of those who have been divorced from wife or husband is often perfectly legitimate and in full accord with Christian teaching. Disregarding all ecclesiastical tradition, they appeal to the Gospel as interpreted by nineteenth and twentieth century ideals, and they maintain that Christ Himself as well as the Apostle sanctioned their lax views regarding the marriage bond.

It may be worth our while then to examine those passages of the New Testament which touch upon the question.

The first declaration of Our Blessed Lord on the subject of divorce is found in the sermon on the mount :

And it hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a bill of divorce.

But I say to you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, excepting the cause of fornication, maketh her to commit adultery; and he that shall marry her that is put away, committeth adultery.—S. Matth. v., 31-32.

And the same doctrine is given in a more extended form at a later period of His public ministry :

And there came to him the Pharisees tempting him, and saying: Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?

Who answering, said to them: Have ye not read, that he who made man from the beginning, Made them male and female? And he said:

For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they two shall be in one flesh.

Therefore now they are not two, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder.

They say to him: Why then did Moses command to give a bill of divorce, and to put away?

He said to them: Because Moses by reason of the hardness of your heart permitted you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so.

And I say to you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and he that shall marry her that is put away, committeth adultery.

Now at first sight we might be inclined to feel that there was something to be said in favor of the non-Catholic interpretation of these words, for a clause seems to be inserted by Our Lord on purpose to afford a loophole for divorce.

Cardinal Cajetan's commentary on the passage is: "This text clearly makes an adulterer to be one who does these two things—namely, put away a wife who has not committed fornication and then marry another. And the reason why this is adultery is clearly that the marriage bond between himself and the wife he has put away still holds; but the text says nothing about the case where a man puts away a guilty wife and marries another. And if you urge that Our Lord's words cannot be superfluous and that by excepting fornication they signify a different solution when other causes exist, then I must confess that this is true; and if you further insist that this difference can only be that he who puts away a *guilty* wife and marries another does not commit adultery, then I answer that the text, according to the plain meaning of the letter, does mean that; but since I dared not oppose myself to the whole flood of the Church's Doctors and Judges I therefore said above that the text said nothing about the case of a man who put away a guilty wife. Consequently I gather from this law of Our Lord Jesus Christ that it is lawful for a man to put away his wife if she be guilty, and that he can then marry another—saving always any contrary definition of the Church."

This is plain, straightforward and unflinching exegesis, and

Cardinal Cajetan's authority is very great. At the same time an examination of the text may lead us to another conclusion:

And there came to him the Pharisees tempting him, and saying: Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?

This was their question and true exegesis demands that we interpret the answer in the light of the question. By the expression "for every cause," which we are hardly justified in rendering "for any cause," they imply that there were, according to their ideas, certain causes which justified such a putting away; thus we are told that though Rabbi Schammai insisted that no man should divorce his wife except in the case of adultery, Hillel, his adversary and the teacher of Gamaliel, allowed divorce if the wife "spoiled the roast" or proved an indifferent cook! They further imply a second question, "And if a man can put away his wife can he marry again?"

Our Lord's answer contains three distinct points. He first of all lays down the absolute indissolubility of marriage:

Who answering said to them: Have ye not read, that he who made man from the beginning, Made them male and female? And he said:

For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they two shall be in one flesh.

Therefore now they are not two, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder.

Nothing could be more positive; it seems to preclude all exception. "No human agent, no human cause can be sufficient to put them asunder." And his questioners felt this so strongly that they at once urged the fact that Moses allowed them divorce:

They say to him: Why then did Moses command to give a bill of divorce, and to put away?

Our Lord answers that this concession was only temporary and, so to speak, coming from Moses:

He saith to them: Because Moses by reason of the hardness of your heart permitted you to put away your wives; but from the beginning it was not so.

But it is now to be abrogated in favor of the original Divine precept, for "a greater than Solomon is here;" nay, a greater than Moses:

But I say to you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and he that shall marry her that is put away, committeth adultery.

In this most solemn piece of legislation the clause "except it be for fornication" constitutes the difficulty. If we compare the parallel passages in S. Mark x., 11-12, and S. Luke xvi., 18, we find that they omit it. This omission, however, is insufficient ground for questioning its genuineness in S. Matthew. The question then is as to the relationship of that clause to the rest of the verse, if it must be

taken with the clause "and shall marry another," and thus declares the two necessary conditions for adultery, so that only he who puts away an innocent wife and marries another is guilty of adultery, then we have no alternative but to admit Cajetan's view that Our Lord implied that separation from an unfaithful wife was a dissolution of the marriage bond. There is, however, no necessity whatever to take it with the clause about marrying another; it may perfectly well be a parenthesis qualifying only the words: "Whosoever shall put away his wife." And that this is really the meaning intended may be gathered, as we said above, from the purport of their question.

They asked an explicit question: "Was it lawful to divorce their wives?" And to this Our Lord gives an explicit answer: "Yes, but only because of her unfaithfulness." But they implied a far more delicate question and one which was indeed the motive of the other: "And if they could put away their wives were they free to marry again?" And to this Our Lord gives a clear and decided answer, making no distinction whatever between her guilt or innocence: "Whosoever shall put away his wife . . . and marry another committeth adultery, and he that shall marry her that is put away committeth adultery."

Is this treatment of the text justified? The way in which the disciples understood it shows that it is so.

His disciples say unto him: If the case of a man with his wife be so, it is not expedient to marry.

Would they have said this if they had understood Our Lord to mean that the wife's infidelity enabled them to leave her and marry again? And note that Our Lord does not correct their view.

Who said to them: All men take not this word, but they to whom it is given.

And in accordance with this view, S. Thomas asks* whether divorcing his wife a man can marry another, and he answers that nothing which supervenes upon matrimony can dissolve the bond. He then proposes the objection: "But we read in S. Matthew xix., 9: '*Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery;*' whence it seems that if a man put away his wife *because of fornication* and marrieth another he does not commit adultery, and his second marriage will be a true one." His answer is brief "that exception given in the Lord's words refers to the dismissal of the wife, and therefore the objection arises from a mistaken rendering (of the text)."

It would make too great a demand upon our space to transcribe S. Augustine's analysis of S. Matthew xix., 9, but in his treatise "de

* Suppl. 62, 5, ad. 4m.

conjugiis adulterinis" he answers the question of Politianus, who wished to interpret the passage in the sense demanded by Cajetan. Politianus had urged that the words of S. Paul:

But to them that are married, not I, but the Lord commandeth, that the wife depart not from her husband.

And if she depart, that she remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband. And let not the husband put away his wife.—I. Cor. vii., 10-11.

meant that either husband or wife were at liberty to insist upon separation whenever they pleased, but that if they did so, both must remain unmarried. It is interesting then to note that S. Augustine decides the meaning of the expression "if she depart" by the words of Our Lord:

And I say to you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and he that shall marry her that is put away, committeth adultery.

"If she depart," he argues, "for fornication," *i. e.*, of her husband, the only cause of separation which the Lord allowed. And he goes on to say that it is impossible to argue from the words of the text that whoever puts away his wife because of her fornication, and marries another, is not guilty of adultery. This, he says, is manifestly a perversion of the text, because the Lord would be conceding to the husband a liberty which S. Paul in the words given above refuses to the wife, whereas the same Apostle, with those very words of Our Lord in his mind, claims absolute equality for husband and wife in this matter:

The wife hath not power of her own body: but the husband. And in like manner the husband also hath not power of his own body: but the wife.—I. Cor. vii., 4.

Thus it was decreed in the Council of Gangres, held in the time of Pope Silvester I., that: "If any woman leaveth her husband, and wishes to so depart because she abhorreth marriage, let her be anathema."

Again, argues the saint, it would be an unfair inference from the words of S. James:

To him therefore who knoweth to do good, and doth it not, to him it is sin.—I. Cor. iv., 17.

if we concluded "therefore he who knoweth not to do good, and doth it not, to him it is no sin;" so similarly is it illegitimate to argue as Politianus has done from Our Lord's own words.

If you ask then why the Lord used so ambiguous an expression, I answer that inasmuch as it would be a more grievous sin to put away an innocent wife and marry another than to put away a guilty wife and marry another, the Lord by condemning the less heinous act as adulterous thereby convicts the more heinous crime of adultery.

And lastly we are bound to explain an ambiguous passage in the Gospels by less ambiguous parallels, but, as we have pointed out above, S. Mark and S. Luke do not insert the crucial clause "except it be for fornication," and they thus leave no doubt as to the precise meaning intended by Our Blessed Lord.

It is perfectly clear then from the foregoing that according to S. Augustine adultery does not dissolve the bond of marriage, though it gives the innocent party a right to a separation, and this he explicitly states later on. He quotes S. Paul to the Romans:

For the woman that hath an husband, whilst her husband liveth is bound to the law. But if her husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband.

"If then," he argues, "she is 'bound as long as her husband liveth,' nothing but her husband's death can release her from that bond. But if, as you (Politianus) say, fornication is equivalent to death, then a woman who commits fornication becomes free; but see what follows, any man who then marries her is free from the charge of adultery!"

Perhaps the most perverse interpretation of Our Lord's words in the sermon on the mount:

And it hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a bill of divorce.

But I say to you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, excepting the cause of fornication, maketh her to commit adultery: and he that shall marry her that is put away, committeth adultery.

is that furnished by Tertullian in his tenth book against Marcion: "I say," he writes, "that Christ only conditionally prohibits divorce on the supposition namely that a man puts away his wife precisely in order to marry another. 'Whosoever shall put away his wife and marry another has committed adultery; and he who marrieth her that is put away by her husband equally committeth adultery,' both of them of course for the same reason she has been put away, namely, for that very object which will not justify such a dismissal, namely, that her husband may marry another; the Lord considers her who is unjustly put away as not put away at all, and the marriage still holds. . . . But to prohibit a thing on certain grounds only is not to entirely prohibit it, and what He did not entirely prohibit He permitted."

We need hardly comment on this, save only to remark the contrast between the above treatment of the passage and the evenly balanced discussion of it by S. Augustine.

But though S. Augustine speaks so decidedly upon this point he yet fully appreciated the difficulty of the passage in S. Matthew. Thus he remarks in his treatise "de Fide et Operibus," cap. 19: "A man who puts away his wife because she is unfaithful, and who

then marries another, ought not perhaps to be put on a par with men who divorce an innocent wife and then marry again. As to the question whether a man who is perfectly justified in putting away his wife because of her adultery becomes himself an adulterer if he marry another, the Sacred Scriptures are so obscure that as far as I can see it is quite excusable to misunderstand them."

And as an instance of the want of unanimity on the question, S. Ambrose in his commentary on I. Cor. vii., "to them that are married not I, but the Lord commandeth . . . let not the husband put away his wife," remarks: "He supposes of course 'except for the cause of fornication,' and therefore he did not add, as he did in the case of the woman, 'and if he depart let him remain unmarried,' for the man is allowed to marry another wife if he has put away his former wife because of her infidelity, since the man is not so strictly bound by the law as the woman, 'for the man is the head of the woman.'" A little further on S. Ambrose expressly denies the woman's right to marry again if she has been compelled to leave her husband because of his infidelity.

It should be noted that both these points have been decided by the Council of Trent. Adultery does not dissolve marriage, and both husband and wife have equal rights in wedlock, as S. Augustine points out so clearly.

So similarly Rabanus Maurus and S. Jerome clearly hold that the bond of matrimony is not annulled by the adultery of one party. Indeed S. Jerome, Ep. 77, ad Oceanum, dwells at some length upon the mistake made on this point by Fabiola, who felt herself forced to leave her husband because of his atrociously wicked life. She then married again in perfectly good faith, but when told of her error she did condign penance.

We must be careful, however, not to push too far the canon of the Council of Trent quoted above. The Church has never defined that the bond of matrimony *cannot* be dissolved by the adultery of one party. She has defined only that the Church cannot err in teaching that it is not to be so dissolved. The schismatic Greeks still maintain that adultery renders the marriage null, but in view of the Church's declarations their opinion must at least be condemned as "*haeresi proxima*."

It should at the same time be pointed out that the Church herself has only by slow degrees arrived at unanimity on this question. Thus in striking contrast to the decrees of Trent and Mileris quoted above we notice that the Council of Granada held in the year 305 enacts that "women who have left their husbands for no cause and have married others are not to receive Communion even at the point of death." (Can. viii.) This seems to at least imply that

there were certain causes justifying a second marriage even during their first husband's lifetime.

Yet on the other hand Pope Zachary I. declared that if a man sinned with his sister-in-law, his wife should put him away and marry again if unable to live unmarried. This decree is given in Gratian, where we also find another decree attributed to the Council of Granada, by which a husband is free to marry again if his wife sin with her brother-in-law. We find similar enactments in the Council of Tribur, Can. xl., held in the year 895. They clearly show that in the eyes of many adultery dissolved the bond of marriage and that the innocent party was free to contract again if he or she so willed. We said that the above decree was "attributed" to the Council of Granada because it is so by Gratian, but we fail to find it among the "Acta" of that Council. On the contrary, the Ninth Canon runs: "The Christian woman who has left her husband by reason of his adultery and wishes to marry another, is to be prohibited from so doing, and if she do marry, let her not be admitted to Communion until the death of her first husband unless sickness should necessitate it."

With S. Augustine we may group S. Chrysostom, Euthymius and Theophylact who follow, S. Hilary and Chromatius. They all agree that the husband has the absolute right, as also the wife, to repudiate his or her adulterous partner, but they allow no remarriage of either of the separated parties during the lifetime of the other.

Cajetan, as we have seen, told the probable that a complete divorce was intended by Our Lord's words on the subject, but this opinion he held subject to the Church's decision and as a possibility only.

The Bishops of Origen's day and Pope Zachary, whom we cited above, permitted such complete divorces and subsequent marriages of the separated parties.

While lastly S. Ambrose and Tertullian not merely concede such permissions, but regard them as the innocent party's due.

HUGH POPE, O. P.

Rugely, England.

Scientific Chronicle.

RADIUM EMANATIONS.

Among the physicists who are actively investigating the peculiar emanations from radium, polonium and other substances, many are giving attention to the most interesting of all the questions involved in the study of these emanations, namely, their origin. These radiations produce thermal, chemical and luminous effects without suffering any apparent diminution. Prominent among the explanations advanced to explain the origin of such emanations we may mention two. The first suggests that the emanations are produced by a chemical transformation in the radiating substance. This explanation simply puts radium, thorium and the other radio-active bodies in the category of fuels, and we should soon be able to point out the limit of the emanations from a given amount of radium, as we are able to determine the heat equivalent of a given amount of coal.

The second explanation is proposed by Sir William Crookes and considers radio-active substances merely as transformers of molecular energy preëxisting in the atmosphere. Should this explanation prove to be the true one, then are we on the verge of entering a field as yet unknown to scientific research. While these theoretical questions remain as yet undetermined, practical applications are made of these emanations and new uses are suggested.

The germicidal action of the emanations from radium seems to be clearly established by well authenticated and successful results in the treatment of cancer, when the malady is external. When carelessly applied severe inflammation of the skin exposed to the emanations may be the result, but when properly applied they seem to have a selective action, destroying diseased tissue only and causing reparative action in such cases as lupus and external malignant growths like cancer. A clear explanation of the mode of action of these emanations has not yet been given. By some it is supposed to be a germicidal action, while others hold that an inflammatory reaction is set up whereby the scavenger cells of the body accumulate, attack and destroy the morbid tissues.

Whatever may be the explanation the results are at least hopeful and have warranted the suggestion that these emanations may be beneficial in the treatment of consumption. Different substances give forth these emanations. We may select those that give the best results for the disease that is to be treated. Thorium acts as

radium, but not with the same degree of activity. The relative degrees of activity may be gathered from the calculation that five minutes' application of radium would be equivalent to ten years' application of the same weight of thorium.

These elements spontaneously give off emanations or gases in small quantity, which gases are themselves radio-active or endowed with the power of giving out rays similar to those radiated by the elements themselves. The process then suggested for utilizing these emanations for the cure of consumption would be to inhale the gases into the lungs and the radiation from the gases would produce the germicidal effect.

The salts of these two elements, which also possess the power of radiation, are not when solid in the best condition for the free escape of the emanations. When, however, the salt is dissolved the stored up emanations are immediately set free, and if these radiated gases are allowed to mingle with the air the patient breathes they will reach the air cells of the lungs and by their own radiations produce the desired effect.

There is a very great peculiarity about these gases and the solutions from which they come. If the emanations from a solution of radium be stored in a gasholder away from the solution, the quantity soon slowly diminishes, and if the solution be enclosed in an air-tight vessel the solution grows a fresh crop of radiations as fast as the old ones disappear. When all the old emanations have gone the solution has reached a maximum radio-activity equivalent to what it had on the dissolving of the salt. This makes a single solution efficient for any number of applications at intervals.

The time for the disappearance of the old emanations from a thorium solution and consequently for the reappearance of maximum activity in the solution is about five minutes. In the case of a radium solution the interval would be about three weeks. Hence when a patient is using a thorium solution it is important that the emanations should reach the lungs in the shortest possible time, since they appear and disappear at such short intervals. This means, however, that in the case of such a solution a continued breathing through it would always indicate a dose proportional to the time. With radium solutions, however, this would not be the case, for once all the emanations had been inhaled there would be no further use of breathing through it and the solution would have to be left tightly closed to regain its emanating power.

The beneficial effect does not cease with the exhalation of the emanations, for it is a property of these emanations to leave on the surfaces of the bodies they come in contact with a film of radio-active matter. This is called "excited" or "induced" radio-activity,

and this condition remains in the air cells of the lungs after the emanations have been exhaled.

A thorium salt like the nitrate, which is easily soluble in water, is recommended for such treatment. This salt is cheap and can be easily procured. It is claimed that there would be no ill effects from an hour's daily inhalation through a solution of 100 grams of thorium nitrate. On the contrary, on account of the great activity of radium only a few milligrams say of radium bromide should be employed and only a small quantity of the gas drawn into the lungs, the dose being increased very slowly.

As this treatment is only in the tentative stage and as these radiations are extremely energetic it should always be conducted under the guidance of a physician thoroughly conversant with the action of this new weapon which physics and chemistry have put into his hands.

The extent of these radio-active substances in nature and a possible natural confirmation of their therapeutic value may be drawn from the discovery of such gases in deep-level spring water and in the waters of several mineral springs.

Professor J. J. Thomson has found such radio-active gas in the waters of certain deep springs and in the tap water of Cambridge, England. In an examination of samples from the hot mineral springs of Bath made at the Blythswood Laboratory, Renfrew, similar radio-active gases were found. The activity of the gas begins to diminish soon after it has been liberated from the waters. This may indicate, as suggested by Mr. H. S. Allen, who communicates the facts to *Nature*, August 13, 1903, that the therapeutic value of the waters is due to the presence of radio-active gases in solution and that hence for the best results the waters must be used on the spot.

Mr. Allen concludes his letter with the following very interesting statement: "Professor Dewar has shown that the Bath waters contain helium. The presence of a radio-active and of an inert gas in the same water is of interest from the point of view of the possible transmutation of such elements."

Sir William Ramsay and Mr. Frederick Soddy in a paper transmitted to the Royal Society in July last and published in the above-mentioned issue of *Nature* give some facts bearing on the possible transmutation of these elements. In the last paragraph of their paper they say: "The maximum amount of the emanation obtained from 50 milligrams of radium bromide was conveyed by means of oxygen into a U-tube, cooled in liquid air, and the latter was then extracted by the pump. It was then washed out with a little fresh oxygen, which was again pumped off. The vacuum tube sealed on to the U-tube, after removing the liquid air, showed no trace of

helium. The spectrum was apparently a new one, probably that of the emanation, but this has not yet been completely examined, and we hope to publish further details shortly. After standing from July 17 to 21, the helium spectrum appeared and the characteristic lines here observed were identical in position with those of a helium tube thrown into the field of vision at the same time. On July 22 the yellow, the green, the two blues and the violet were seen, and in addition the three new lines also present in the helium obtained from radium. A confirmatory experiment gave identical results."

THE MERCURY-VAPOR ELECTRIC LAMP.

This lamp, the invention of Mr. Peter Cooper Hewitt, has become an object of interest in the electrical world on account of its utility in other lines of electrical investigation. Essentially the lamp consists of a tube from which the air has been exhausted and provided with an electrical terminal at each end. The lower end of the tube is bulb shaped and contains mercury. This end forms the negative electrode. When a direct current is sent through the tube the vapor of mercury glows with a bluish white light. This light is considered beneficial on account of the absence of red rays, which are considered injurious to the eyesight. Its chief claim to consideration is its high efficiency, as seven times the amount of electrical energy would be consumed to obtain the same illumination from the ordinary incandescent lamp. As a practical source of illumination the lamp seems up to the present to be only moderately successful.

One characteristic of the lamp is that a high initial voltage is required to start the lamp and special devices were made for that purpose. Once it was started, however, it offered but a very moderate resistance to the passage of the current. These peculiarities were discovered while using the direct current. When, however, an alternating current was sent through the lamp a new application of the lamp was discovered. It was found that only the positive waves passed through, and that the negative waves were stopped. This at once suggested the possibility of the lamp as a transformer or rectifier to convert an alternating current into a direct one. At the present this is done by large and very expensive rotary converters.

To transform by means of the lamp all that is necessary is to supply as many positive terminals as there are phases to be transformed, and adding one additional terminal with the use of the

mercury-vapor lamp and one negative terminal a continuous series of electrical impulses in one direction or a direct current is obtained. It is said to be a transformer of high efficiency, that is the loss of electrical pressure in the transformation is small. If, for example, the pressure of the original alternating current was 1,400 volts, there would be a loss of only one per cent. in the direct current pressure. The simplicity and cheapness of the arrangement, if it proves to be a durable transformer, will undoubtedly give it a wide sphere of usefulness.

But yet another field seems to be open to the use of the mercury-vapor lamp, and that is the field of wireless telegraphy. In this particular field most attention has up to the present been given to the receiving apparatus, especially to the coherer. The coherer has undergone the greatest modification until we have the most sensitive of all in Marconi's magnetic detector.

In the sending apparatus the source of the transmitted electrical waves was the electrical discharge across a spark gap in the secondary circuit of an induction coil. Two difficulties are met with in this mode of stating the waves. One is that the rate of oscillation cannot be well controlled and the other is that the terminals either side of the spark gap, usually polished metal spheres, are rapidly burned away by the action of the electrical discharge.

In experimenting with the mercury-vapor lamp it was found that with a suitable condenser it became a means of disruptive discharges of any desired frequency. This places it as a transmitter of electrical waves at once efficient and simple. One salient feature of the lamp as a transmitter of electrical impulses is that the rate can be controlled and hence selective telegraphy may be assured. If this lamp commercially bears out the results which laboratory experiments indicate, it will be one of the most useful devices in the electrical field.

WIRELESS TELEPHONY.

When wireless telegraphy was given to the world it was most natural that investigators should turn their attention to wireless telephony. This many have done, and it is of scientific interest to note their success. Up to the present the distances to which conversation can satisfactorily be carried on by the wireless method are not very great, but yet sufficiently so to open up a field of usefulness for the new method. The most interesting of the later experi-

ments in this direction are those of Mr. A. Frederick Collins, described in the *Scientific American* for May 23 last.

Mr. Collins has been experimenting for three years, with the result that he was able to telephone between two ferry boats moving in opposite directions on the North River between Jersey City and New York. In general character the arrangements of the sending and receiving instruments are like those of the wireless telegraph. Antennæ are required, as in the latter system, and for this purpose wires strung from the flagstaffs of the boats answered admirably. To get a good earth contact was not so easy. It seemed simple enough at first, and it was first made by attaching metal plates to their wires and throwing them overboard into the water. Although these plates weighed ten pounds, the rapid motion of the boat prevented them from sinking and they danced upon the water, thus frequently interrupting the earth contact. Better results were obtained by dropping heavy copper tubing down the rain pipes to the water. But even then the contact was not satisfactory. In any practical application of the method, however, this difficulty can be overcome by attaching the plates to the bottom of the vessel.

In the first test after the installation of the instruments on the two boats a message was distinctly received from the inventor when the two boats were five hundred feet apart. The next day, May 9, a public test was made, with like success. It must be remembered that in these tests the water contacts were poor and the battery current inadequate. In experiments at Congers articulate speech was heard a distance of 6,000 feet. When the inventor was asked how far he hoped to communicate under the new conditions on the boats he would not predict more than 1,000 feet.

The capability of doing even this much would be of great value in time of storms and fogs. No expert telegrapher would be required, no time would be lost in translating the message and many harbor accidents thereby avoided.

D. T. O'SULLIVAN, S. J.

Boston, Mass.

Book Reviews.

THE GREAT ENCYCLICAL LETTERS OF POPE LEO XIII. Translations from Approved Sources. With Preface by Rev. John J. Wynne, S. J. 8vo., pp. 580. New York: Benziger Brothers.

The writer of the preface to this book introduces it very nicely in these words:

"The popular demand for the Encyclicals and Apostolical Letters of a Roman Pontiff is something so novel as to constitute of itself a proof of the esteem in which he is held. It would seem that whatever is written of Leo XIII. in books or newspapers, instead of satisfying the universal desire for a knowledge of him, only inspires the wish to know more and the conviction that the writings of a man of such powers and world-wide sympathies must contain messages of interest and benefit to all humanity.

"It is precisely the merit of the letters of the late Pope that no matter when they were written, or to whom they were addressed, they are of actual and universal interest, as intelligible to the layman and illiterate as to the theologian and scholar; as urgent in their appeals to those who are not within the fold of which he was chief pastor as to the children of the household. His arguments could not but command attention, drawn as they were from history, experience and reason, as well as from Scripture and tradition; and his sincere interest in the civil and social improvements of every nation, whether Catholic or not, made all hearken to his plea for religion as a chief factor of true progress."

A glance at the contents of this book will show that the writer of this introduction does not exaggerate. The variety of the subjects is surprising, and the universal application of the matter still more so. Sociology, philosophy, theology, economics, politics—using the word in its best sense—history, ascetics—all are handled in a masterly manner by this wonderful Pontiff.

His writings are all distinguished for their clearness, their broadness, their learning; but the most striking feature of those which appeal most strongly to the average reader is their timeliness and their practical application to existing conditions. A striking illustration of this is found in his Letter over the Relations of Employer and Workman. It may be truthfully said that this document alone would settle all disputes between employer and workman, and prevent misunderstandings in the future, if those concerned would study it and follow its directions. It is worthy of lengthy quotation because its application is so clear at the present time:

"For the result of civil change and revolution has been to divide

society into two widely differing castes. On the one side there is the party which holds power because it holds wealth; which has in its grasp the whole of labor and trade; which manipulates for its own benefit and its own purposes all the sources of supply, and which is even represented in the councils of the State itself. On the other side there is the needy and powerless multitude, broken down and suffering, and ever ready for disturbance. If working people can be encouraged to look forward to obtaining a share in the land, the consequence will be that the gulf between vast wealth and sheer poverty will be bridged over, and the respective classes will be brought nearer to one another. A further consequence will result in the greater abundance of the fruits of the earth. Men always work harder and more readily when they work on that which belongs to them; nay, they learn to love the very soil that yields, in response to the labor of their hands, not only food to eat, but an abundance of good things for themselves and those that are dear to them. That such a spirit of willing labor would add to the produce of the earth and to the wealth of the community is self-evident. And a third advantage would spring from this: men would cling to the country in which they were born; for no one would exchange his country for a foreign land if his own afforded the means of living a decent and happy life. These three important benefits, however, can be reckoned on only provided that a man's means be not drained and exhausted by excessive taxation. The right to possess private property is derived from nature, not from man, and the State has the right to control its use in the interests of the public good alone, but by no means to absorb it altogether. The State would, therefore, be unjust and cruel if under the name of taxation it were to deprive the private owner of more than is fitting.

"If we turn now to things external and corporeal, the first concern of all is to save the poor workers from the cruelty of greedy speculators, who use human beings as mere instruments of money-making. It is neither just nor human so to grind men down with excessive labor as to stupefy their minds and wear out their bodies. Man's powers, like his general nature, are limited, and beyond these limits he cannot go. His strength is developed and increased by use and exercise, but only on condition of due intermission and proper rest. Daily labor, therefore, should be so regulated as not to be protracted over longer hours than the strength admits. How many and how long the intervals of rest should be must depend on the nature of the work, on circumstances of time and place, and on the health and strength of the workmen. Those who work in mines and quarries, and extract coal, stone and metals from the

bowels of the earth, should have shorter hours in proportion as their labor is more severe and trying to health. Then again the season of the year should be taken into account; for not infrequently a kind of labor is easy at one time which at another is intolerable or exceedingly difficult. Finally, work which is quite suitable for a strong man cannot reasonably be required from a woman or child. And in regard to children, great care should be taken not to place them in workshops and factories until their bodies and minds are sufficiently developed. For just as very rough weather destroys the buds of spring, so does too early an experience of life's hard toil blight the young promise of a child's faculties, and render any true education impossible. Women, again, are not suited for certain occupations; a woman is by nature fitted for home work, and it is that which is best adapted at once to preserve her modesty and to promote the good bringing-up of children and the well-being of the family. As a general principle it may be laid down that a workman ought to have leisure and rest proportionate to the wear and tear of his strength; for waste of strength must be repaired by cessation from hard work.

"Let it then be taken for granted that workman and employer should, as a rule, make free agreements, and in particular should agree freely as to wages; nevertheless, there underlies a dictate of natural justice more imperious and ancient than any bargain between man and man, namely, the remuneration ought to be sufficient to support a frugal and well-behaved wage-earner. If through necessity or fear of a worse evil the workman accept harder conditions because an employer or contractor will afford him no better, he is made the victim of force and injustice. In these and similar questions, however—such as, for example, the hours of labor in different trades, the sanitary precautions to be observed in factories and workshops, etc.—times and localities differ so widely, it is advisable that recourse be had to societies or boards such as we shall mention.

"But if the question be asked, How must one's possessions be used? the Church replies without hesitation in the words of the holy Doctor: 'Man should not consider his outward possessions as his own, but as common to all, so as to share them without hesitation when others are in need. Whence the Apostle saith, Command the rich of this world . . . to offer with no stint, to apportion largely.' True, no one is commanded to distribute to others that which is required for his own needs and those of his household; nor even to give away what is reasonably required to keep up becomingly his condition in life; 'for no one ought to live other than becomingly.' But when what necessity demands has been supplied and one's standing fairly taken thought for, it becomes a duty to

give to the indigent out of what remains over. 'Of that which remaineth give alms.' It is a duty, not of justice (save in extreme cases), but of Christian charity—a duty not enforced by human law. But the laws and judgments of men must yield place to the laws and judgments of Christ the true God, who in many ways urges on His followers the practice of almsgiving: 'It is more blessed to give than to receive;' and who will count a kindness done or refused to the poor as done or refused to Himself: 'As long as you did it to one of My least brethren, you did it to Me.'"

The wide circulation of this collection must do incalculable good. Its interest and value are not limited to any particular class, but they appeal to all. The publishers have rendered a real service to the public by making the collection so accessible, and whoever made the selection has also placed us under no slight obligation.

CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS; or, a Rational Exposition of the Foundations of Faith. By *Rev. W. Devivier, S. J.* Translated from the Sixteenth Edition of the Original French. Preceded by an Introduction on the Existence of God, and a Treatise on the Human Soul, its Liberty, Spirituality, Immortality and Destiny. By *Rev. L. Peeters, S. J.* Edited augmented and adapted to English Readers by *Rev. Joseph C. Sasia, S. J.* Two volumes, 8vo., pp. 557 and 430. San Jose, Cal.: Papp & Hogan, Printers. Price, \$2.50 for two volumes. For sale by leading Catholic booksellers.

CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS: A Defense of the Catholic Faith. By *Rev. W. Devivier, S. J.* Translated by Miss Elia McMahon. Edited by the Right Rev. S. G. Messmer, D. D., D. C. L., Bishop of Green Bay, Wis. 8vo., pp. 583. Price, \$1.75 net. New York: Benziger Brothers

By a rare coincidence two translations of the same book have come from the press at the same time with publishers as far part as New York and California. This speaks well for the zeal of the learned editors who are devoting themselves to such excellent work. It also indicates the value of the original, which attracted the attention of scholars having no connection with one another, but who independently deemed it worthy of reproduction. It gives promise of the rapid advancement of truth, for the spread of books like this is the same as the diffusion of light.

In the main they are the same book, and therefore there is no opposition between them. Nor should there be any real competition, but they should advance from opposite sides to combat error and crush it between them.

The usual order is followed. The work is divided into two parts, treating respectively of "The Christian Religion" and "The Roman Catholic Church." In the first division, after general explanations, we have chapters on the "Historic Value of the Bible," the "Demonstration of the Divinity of the Christian Religion" and the

"Divinity of Christ," with a consideration of all the incidental questions that are necessarily connected with these.

In the second division, after general notions have been disposed of, the thesis that "The Church of Rome is the True Church of Jesus Christ" is set forth and defended. This is followed by an examination of "Certain Prerogatives Conferred by Jesus Christ on His Church" and "Certain Accusations Against the Church." The division closes with a chapter on the "Church and Civilization." We have not enumerated the sub-divisions because they are too numerous and they follow in logical order. We shall not dwell on the relative merits of the two translations, because they are both good and serve the purpose of making the truth known. Nor shall we stop to point out minor defects which are incidental to all human work, book-making not excepted. Let us rather remind the reader that no better book can be found to explain and defend Christianity in general and the Catholic Church in particular than the work before us.

May we not truthfully say that ignorance of the truth is the great evil of the day? May not many of the other great evils, if not most of them, be traced back to this ignorance of Divine Truth and of the divinely appointed exponent of it, the Church of Jesus Christ? This ignorance is due principally to our system of education, which is almost universally altogether secular. We must dispel it by spreading the truth. We have excellent opportunities in the large manufacturing establishments and stores where great crowds from many directions are brought together.

If a manual like the one before us could be read in such places, darkness would roll away as the night before the sun. But since this is not practicable, those who are members of the true fold should prepare themselves to give an account at all times for the faith that is in them.

In the two volume edition of the work there is much additional matter. The editor informs us that he has added 450 pages in order to adapt it better to the English-speaking public, and to fit it to meet the demands of a wider class of readers in every condition of society.

The first 206 pages treat of the existence of God, of His principal attributes or perfections, and of the liberty, spirituality and immortality of the human soul, with convincing answers to the most common objections. An entire article of thirty-one pages has been added on the destiny of the human soul, the sanction of God's laws and the eternal punishment to be inflicted on impenitent sinners.

An article of twenty pages on so-called Christian science is very timely.

A group of important notes at the end of the second volume is well worthy of notice.

Altogether it is a great book, and we hope that it will have a sale in keeping with its importance.

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS—1493-1898. Explorations by Early Navigators, Descriptions of the Islands and their Peoples, their History and Records of the Catholic Missions, as related in Contemporaneous Books and Manuscripts, showing the Political, Economic, Commercial and Religious Conditions of those Islands from their earliest relations with European Nations to the end of the Nineteenth Century. Translated from the Originals. Edited and annotated by Emma Helen Blair and James Alexander Robertson, with historical introduction and additional notes by Edward Gaylord Bourne. With Maps, Portraits and other illustrations. In fifty-five volumes. Volume V., 1582-1583. Octavo, pp. 320. Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Co.

A very important announcement accompanies this volume of the greatest work on the Philippines. Originally the publishers intended to bring it down to the beginning of the nineteenth century; now it will be extended to the end of that century. This is possible without increasing the number of volumes, and therefore without advancing the price of the work.

The announcement is most welcome, because it was a matter of regret to all who were interested in the work and who had observed the masterly and exhaustive manner in which it was being done, that it was not to cover the whole field. It is hardly likely that a similar work will ever be done because this work supplies every need and unless the present publishers continued it, probably it would never have been supplemented on the same scale as the original. Now the value of the work is very much increased, because it will be complete to date.

Although the present volume covers only two years, they are pregnant with events of great importance. These are of particular interest to Catholic readers because they include the coming of the zealous and fearless Bishop Domingo de Salazar. "The Spanish conquerors are ruthlessly oppressing the Indians, caring but little for the opposition made by the friars; but Salazar exerts as far as possible his ecclesiastical authority, and, besides, vigorously urges the King to shield those unfortunate victims of Spanish rapacity. Various humane laws are accordingly enacted for the protection of the natives, but of course this interference by the Bishop occasions a bitter hostility between the ecclesiastical and the secular powers—perhaps never to be quieted. With Salazar come Jesuit fathers, who establish in the islands the missionary work of that order.

"In a letter dated June 16, 1582, Governor Penalosa reports that

the conversion of the natives is making good progress, but there are not enough missionaries. He recommends that a convent be established in every city and village, and that missionaries be sent directly from the mother country, rather than from New Spain, as in the latter case they soon become discontented after coming to the Philippines. He complains because the Franciscans have gone to China."

This volume also contains a short account of the first settlement of Nueva Segovia in 1582. By far the most valuable and interesting feature is a letter to the authorities in Spain written by a soldier named Miguel de Loarca, who was one of the earlier conquerors and settlers there. "Beginning with Cebú, as the first settlement was made therein, he describes each island then known to the Spaniards in the group—noting its size, contour and population; and enumerating the encomiendas assigned therein, the officials in the Spanish settlements, the products of the islands, etc.

"With this information Loarca incorporates many interesting details regarding the social and economic condition of the natives." He also describes at some length the religious beliefs of the Pintados or Visayan Indians.

Two Papal decrees dated September 15 and October 20, 1582, found the Philippine province of the Dominican Order.

Too much cannot be said in praise of the way in which this work is progressing, and we feel that we are doing a favor to educational institutions in calling their attention to the importance of procuring it.

IRELAND UNDER ENGLISH RULE; or, a Plea for the Plaintiff. By *Thomas Addis Emmett, M. D., LL. D.* Two volumes, 8vo., pp. xxv.-233 and 358. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

The author thus states his purpose in writing these two beautiful volumes:

"The object of the writer has been to trace certain causes and effects and to show, what is self-evident in the abstract, that no result can be produced without an adequate cause. As the chief proposition it will be shown that Ireland has only prospered under English rule for a brief interval—when at least Irishmen managed Irish affairs, although these were conducted by a minority, with the added disadvantage that fully eight-tenths of the population of Ireland at that time were disfranchised on a religious test. The logical deduction then presents itself that Ireland has never prospered because of misrule on the part of the English Government.

"This will be proved to have been the case, as well as that Irish

affairs were conducted by England for centuries in accordance with a settled and fixed purpose that Ireland should not prosper. As part of the indictment against England it will be shown that only within a recent period has the effort been abandoned, whenever an opportunity presented, to exterminate by the sword the Catholic portion of the population; since that time, the same policy has been indirectly but as successfully followed in depopulating the country by famine and forced emigration. Only the more prominent instances will be cited in proof, but even these form a pandemonium of horrors, more brutal in detail than could be gleaned from the deeds of any other civilized nation."

The writer tells us that he has no quarrel with the English people as individuals, but that his indictment is against that "unique political organization known as the British Government—a system well fitted for the oppression of the whole human race, with the exception of the English people themselves; with a settled policy since the Norman conquest, which has remained unchanged in the quest of gain and new territory."

Although this indictment is severe, yet the facts quoted to substantiate it are numerous and overwhelming. Nor can it be said that the author is prejudiced. He shows throughout the work a true spirit of fairness and a desire to tell only the truth. It is not the business of the historian to suppress the truth or to color it, and Dr. Emmett is an historian.

It is a sad, dreary story, interesting but far from pleasant, but it must be told.

The publishers deserve great credit for the manner in which they have done their part. A nicer piece of bookmaking could not be found.

A **LATIN GRAMMAR.** By William Gardner Hale, Professor and Head of the Department of Latin, and Carl Darling Buck, Professor of Sanskrit and Indo-European Comparative Philology in the University of Chicago. 12mo., cloth, 388 pages. Ginn & Co., New York and Boston. List price, \$1.00.

This new Latin grammar is the work of specialists and embodies the results of many years of independent study in their respective fields. It therefore presents the facts of the language in their true relations to one another.

The field covered by the book is the syntax actually found in high school Latin, with the addition of a small number of constructions which were necessary for a general skeleton of the treatment. All matters that do not occur at all in high school Latin or that are rare

in the Latin ordinarily read in colleges, have been studiously omitted. For the use of high school or college teachers these extraneous topics and special idioms are presented in a special supplement now in preparation.

In general, the authors have aimed to give only such explanations as are certain, reasonable, simple and deal with the relations between existing Latin forms. Nevertheless, care has been taken to present the true historical development of the language in a way that will best appeal to the intelligence of the young student, that will be most helpful to his memory and that will give him a sound foundation for possible further study.

The citations in the grammar are those given for all the examples taken from actual Latin—most of them from the Latin read in the high school; but here and there other examples have been chosen as more simple or as affording parallels in a series.

DIE GESCHICHTE DES LEIDENS UND STERBENS, der Auferstehung und Himmelfahrt des Herrn. Von *Dr. Joannes Belser*. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Price, \$2.85 net.

The learned professor of theology at the University of Tübingen, whose admirable "Introduction to the New Testament" we commended in a recent issue, here gives us in a volume of 524 pages a complete and detailed narrative of the sufferings and death, the resurrection and ascension of Our Lord. We have no hesitation in pronouncing Dr. Belser's work as, away and beyond, the erudite and scientific treatise on these sublime subjects which we have met with in any language. It displays in an eminent degree that blending of piety and learning which is essential to every successful religious work. May it soon appear among us in our own tongue.

ALLEN AND GREENOUGH'S NEW LATIN GRAMMAR. For Higher Schools and Colleges. By *J. B. Greenough*, late Professor of Latin in Harvard University; *George Lyman Kittredge*, Professor of English in Harvard University; *A. A. Howard*, Professor of Latin in Harvard University, and *Benjamin L. D'Ooge*, Professor of Latin in the Michigan State Normal College. Ginn & Company, Boston and New York. List price, \$1.20.

This well-known Latin grammar, although in a new form, still remains the "Allen and Greenough Grammar" in scope and general plan, and retains the characteristic qualities that have given the book a world-wide distinction. But the book has been revised in every detail to bring it into harmony with the latest results of scholarship

the world over, and has been rearranged where necessary to make it as convenient for use as is possible.

The authors have been assisted on details by the most eminent specialists, among whom are Professor Sheldon, of Harvard University, and Professor Morris, of Yale University. The book therefore is thoroughly trustworthy. All the most recent grammatical theories have been considered, and if they have not been adopted it is because the old ones are better. The paragraphs have been renumbered throughout and the typography of the book has been completely changed. A new scheme of type display unquestionably marks the highest typographical achievement in books of this character.

THE JONES READERS. Five volumes. 12mo. Ginn & Co., Boston and New York.

This series is intended to cover the reading work of the eight grades of the elementary schools. The author, President L. H. Jones, of the Michigan State Normal College, formerly Superintendent of the city schools of Indianapolis and later of Cleveland, is well equipped for work of this kind, which requires exceptional experience and judgment. It is not sufficient to gather together many pleasing selections, but they must be gathered from approved sources, must teach useful lessons, and must be suited to the capacity of those for whom the books are intended. The author has kept all these requirements before him, and the result is a series that will command attention and patronage. The publishers tell us that "especial care has been taken to secure a definite moral effect in addition to intellectual development. Along with their daily reading, pupils will gradually and unconsciously acquire correct standards of conduct and right views of life."

This is as it should be, but we don't believe it can be done successfully without coming into conflict with the sectarian bugbear. Of course our readers will understand that these moral lessons are not taught in the Catholic way or by Catholic authors, with one or two exceptions. Otherwise the books are excellent in every respect.

COLONEL ALEXANDER K. MCCLURE'S RECOLLECTIONS OF HALF A CENTURY. Large 8vo., pp. vii. x 502. Illustrated. Salem, Mass.: The Salem Press Co.

The author thus declares his purpose:

"I shall give in these chapters of random recollections important

contributions to history, made especially entertaining and instructive by personal knowledge and incident. After more than fifty years of active participation in political and public affairs, the most of the time closely related to the great political movements of all parties in State and nation, with personal acquaintance, more or less intimate with the leading chieftains of peace and war, I hope to furnish new and fresh contributions to the history of our great Republic outside of the ordinary lines of historical record."

Few men are as well fitted for work of this kind as Colonel McClure. To the general qualifications with which nature endowed him, and which were developed by a good general education, have been added the training of the lawyer, the politician and the journalist. He has very many interesting things to say, and he says them in an interesting manner.

The illustrations are an important feature of the book. In several instances they are reproductions of old photographs. The book is well made.

TRACTATUS DE DEO-HOMINE, SIVE DE VERBO INCARNATO. Auctore *Laurentio Janssens, S. T. D.* Two volumes. I., *Christologia*. Price, \$3.60. II., *Mariologia et Soteriologia*. Price, \$4.25. Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis.

These two stately volumes form the fifth and sixth tomes of Jansen's great commentary on the Summa of St. Thomas, adapted to the needs of modern times. The author, a Belgian Benedictine of the Beuron Congregation, is Rector of St. Anselm's College in Rome and Consultor of the Congregation of the Index. The work is worthy of the palmiest days of Benedictine industry, and reflects great credit on the illustrious Order to which the author belongs. True to the motto which he has adopted, he brings forth from a well-treasured mind "nova et vetera." He has the rare art of clothing the most recondite truths in the simplest words and can be read throughout with extreme ease. Especially commendable is his treatment of the place of Mary in the plan of redemption. There is a warmth of expression about his Mariology which springs from the depths of a loving heart and communicates itself to the reader. We strongly commend the work, especially to the preachers of the divine word.

INSTRUCTIO PASTORALIS EYSTETTENSIS. Editio quinta Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis. 620 pages. Price, \$2.85.

This widely known book was first issued during the episcopate of Bishop Raymond Anthony, the sixty-sixth successor of St. Willi-

bald in the venerable see of Eichstätt in Bavaria. This was as long ago as the year 1768. The original manuscript informs us that the compilers were Dr. Ignatius Heissig, canon and confessor of the Bishop and the Jesuit Father Paul Krauß. As a condensed manual containing the most needful information for the instruction of the clergy in charge of souls, it stands unequaled, and richly deserves the place in the esteem of Bishops and pastors which it has kept for above a century. The fifth edition, much increased in volume and thoroughly revised, brings it completely down to date. No department of pastoral activity will be found to have been overlooked. For Bishops making the canonical visitation of their dioceses and for hard-worked priests on the mission who wish to be well-informed on all practical subjects pertaining to their duties, we know of no better book. We also recommend it warmly to those who are preparing themselves for clerical examinations.

CASUS CONSCIENTIAE ad usum confessoriorum compositi et soluti: ab Augustino Lehmkuhl, S. J. Vol. 1. Herder: Freiburg and St. Louis. Price, \$2.40 net.

True to his word, Father Lehmkuhl presents us the first and remaining volume of his Cases of Conscience a half year after the appearance of the previously published second volume. The cases proposed and disposed of in the present volume cover thoroughly the ground usually treated of in the first part of our Moral Theologies, namely, the fundamental principles of Christian ethics, the commandments of God, the precepts of the Church, justice, contracts, etc. That the work is extremely valuable goes without saying. We could wish that those who discourse so glibly about "Jesuit casuistry" would take the trouble to scan this collection of Cases of Conscience and see for themselves upon how solid a basis the edifice of Catholic morality is erected.

INSTITUTIONES JURIS ECCLESIASTICI. Quas in Usus Scholarum scripsit Jos. Laurentius, S. J. Freiburg and St. Louis: Herder. Price, net \$3.50.

We have no hesitation in pronouncing this the most perfect textbook of Canon Law which we have ever read. Within the compass of 680 pages the student has a full survey of the Church Laws presented to him in the clearest, plainest and most intelligible manner. From beginning to end the exposition goes forward with a simple majesty that is truly admirable. No one who exercises any ecclesiastical office can afford to take a step without consulting Laurentius. The index is full and complete.

To avoid fine, this book should be returned on
or before the date last stamped below

20M-8-48

ANNEX

ANNEX

ANNEX

[illegible]

